



3 1761 11631315 6



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

Thursday, September 2, 1953

Tuesday, January 31 — Wednesday, March 7, 1956














Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116313156>



Gov. Doc  
Ont  
h



ONTARIO

# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, September 8, 1955

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1955



*Price per session \$7.50. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.*



## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, September 8, 1955

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Nomination for office of Speaker, Mr. Frost .....                           | 1  |
| Appreciation of election as Speaker, Mr. Downer .....                       | 6  |
| Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor .....            | 8  |
| Motion for printing Hansard, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                     | 8  |
| Dispensing Debate on Speech from the Throne, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....     | 9  |
| Select Committee on Conditional Sales Contracts, Mr. Frost, agreed to ..... | 22 |
| Select Committee on Smoke Control, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....               | 23 |
| Select Committee on Toll Roads, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                  | 24 |
| Prorogation Speech, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor .....                | 24 |
| Prorogation .....   | 24 |



854728



# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

## DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, HELD IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1955.

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1955

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met,

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having entered the House, took his seat upon the Throne.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): I am commanded by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor to state that he does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law; but today, at a subsequent hour, His Honour will declare the causes of the calling of this Legislature.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Members of the Legislative Assembly, it is my duty to call upon you to elect one of your number to preside over your deliberations, as Speaker.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Clerk, and members of the Twenty-fifth Legislative Assembly of Ontario: our first duty is to choose a Speaker to preside over the deliberations of this House, and to occupy an old and honoured position in our parliamentary practice.

It has been customary since Confederation that a Speaker should be chosen, to occupy that honoured position for one Parliament, although there are a few exceptions to that in the history of the province. In the 24 Legislatures so far held, there have been 23 Speakers.

The previous incumbent of that position in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Parliaments is one of the exceptions to the rule, as it has very generally obtained since Confederation. The only Speaker who is in a similar position to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, the hon. Mr. Davies, was the hon. Mr. Clarke, who occupied that position in the 1880's and who afterwards became Clerk of the House.

My recollection is that the present Clerk of the House is only the fifth who has occupied that position since those early days. As I have said, in the period of Ontario's history since 1867, we have had 23 Speakers to date, generally following the pattern of the tradition, and we have just recently appointed the fifth Clerk of the House, whose father occupied that position for many years before him.

I should like, first of all, to comment upon the great service rendered by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. It is not customary in the House to refer to members by name in the chamber, but

I feel that I should on this occasion mention the hon. M. C. Davies, who occupied the position of Speaker with great distinction during the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Parliaments.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) who was then the Prime Minister, had the great privilege of nominating Mr. Davies as Speaker, on, I think, February 10, 1949. It was my privilege subsequently, during my premiership, to again nominate Mr. Davies, as Speaker for the Twenty-fourth Legislature, seconded by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) who was then the leader of the Opposition.

I have had several conversations with the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. On August 23rd, he wrote a very beautiful letter indeed dealing with this matter, which I shall make available and place on the records of the House. At this time, however, I will refer to one or two paragraphs.

His letter reads in part:

No one appreciates more than do I the great honour which has been bestowed upon me by my fellow members since 1949. It has been my pleasure to have served two full terms, the longest in the history of our province, and for that opportunity I am more than grateful. The kindness, understanding, courtesy and consideration of members from all Parties are among my most treasured memories. For such, I can never give repayment.

As our tradition is based on precedent and lest it become a practice that a Speaker shall continue on and on, I wish to advise you, Sir, that I feel in the best interest of our provincial tradition I shall ask you, as leader of the government, who, naturally, will have considerable say in nominating Mr. Speaker, not to consider me as looking for the position again. I do this from a deep feeling that we must preserve our tradition of not being obligated to continue Mr. Speaker in office.

Added to this, I have held the position with considerable sacrifice to my Church. My people have been most

generous in their willingness to give not only in a military sense but in a political sense as well for my country. We have just completed a new Church building and I am now completing 33 years of service in my parish, and my duty to my Church is my first and greatest responsibility.

May I add in conclusion the debt of gratitude I owe to my devoted wife, who has without question accepted her added responsibilities with cheerfulness and willingness on every occasion. Just during the last session she was hostess to nearly 1000 visitors in the apartment. No small part of whatever help I may have been able to give has been due to the sacrifice and ready help of Inez.

I again thank all the members of the Legislature for this wonderful opportunity to have been servant and master.

Mr. Clerk, I wrote to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, acknowledging that letter, and I know that in this I expressed the feelings of the members of the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Legislatures, many of whom are sitting in this Chamber today.

My letter was as follows:

Relative to your letter of August 23rd and my conversations with you, may I say how much I appreciate your regard for the traditions in relation to the Speaker's office and as well the manner in which you have maintained the dignity of that office. In effect, you yourself have added to the traditions which we all desire to preserve.

On February 10, 1949, you were elected Speaker of the House on the nomination of the then Prime Minister, The Honourable T. L. Kennedy. Subsequently during my own premiership you were again nominated and elected to serve during the Twenty-fourth Legislature. Thus you have served over two full Parliaments, a record which is only equalled by that of The Honourable Charles Clarke who served similarly in the 80's and who afterwards became Clerk of the



House. Since 1867, in 24 Parliaments there have been 23 Speakers.

May I thank you for the sentiments contained in your letter. In regard to the reference to your own parish, may I say that I am aware of the place it has occupied in your thoughts, actions and affections.

At this time may I thank you on behalf of all of the members who sat during your speakership in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Parliament for your great services to your province, for your fairness and impartiality, for your high regard for the dignity and the traditions of this great office. As I have stated, you yourself have added to the traditions attached to the speakership here in our province.

Your life has been one of service to your Church and your country, including service with The Royal Canadian Air Force during the last World War. Ahead of you in this House and in the life of the country are further great services, in all of which we join in wishing you well.

May I also thank Mrs. Davies who has so ably and brilliantly assisted you in the work of the speakership. We extend to both of you our grateful thanks.

Mr. Clerk and gentlemen of the Assembly; may I say it is my privilege to nominate a member of this Assembly to serve as Speaker during the Twenty-fifth Parliament of the Province of Ontario, such nomination to be seconded by the hon. member for Grey South, who will be recognized officially as leader of the Opposition when the Speaker is appointed. I am certain this represents a period of time of very great importance to our province and our country, and it is now my pleasure to nominate a well-respected colleague of all of us in this House, regardless of our political affiliations, in the person of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, Mr. Alfred Wallace Downer.

Mr. Downer is an old friend of most of us. He was elected to the Legislature in the year of Grace 1937, in which year

I, and a very few other hon. members sitting here, came into this Assembly.

Mr. Downer is a well-known person in public life in this province. I have not been told where he gets his name. However, "Alfred" is no doubt after Alfred the Great; "Wallace" after that great King of Scotland who many of us revere, and "Downer" comes from an old Simcoe County family, a very great county indeed.

It is a pleasure to nominate him as one who is associated with two great, old counties, Dufferin and Simcoe, and particularly may I refer to Simcoe County, my native county, which is, of course, very dear to my heart. The only question which might be raised in connection with the hon. member is that although he was born in Simcoe County, he was not born in or near Orillia.

Mr. Clerk, may I just say that Mr. Downer has served his country long and faithfully. He has served it through his Church. He is an Anglican—that seems to be one of the requisites of the speakership in this House. He has served his parish in Simcoe County faithfully for many, many years. For 18 years, he has been a member of this House. In World War II, he served in Italy and in North Africa with the Canadian Army. He is now Chaplain of the Twenty-eighth Armoured Regiment, bearing also the name "Simcoe Foresters," which again raises memories in my mind, because it was with that regiment, before it was an armoured regiment, that 40 years ago this very month, I commenced my military service—in 1915.

Mr. Downer, since that time—who, by the way, is Captain Downer in the military field—has served his country well and faithfully. In placing his name in nomination before the hon. members of this House, may I say that I am satisfied that Mr. Downer, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, will follow the traditions of his predecessors, particularly his immediate predecessor, in maintaining the honour and dignity of this House, and the honour and dignity attached to the speakership. This high office dates back many centuries in



parliamentary life, and is part of the way of life of our people; in Ontario, it goes back into our traditions for 163 years, because it was in the little town of Newark—now Niagara-on-the-Lake—in Navy Hall, which is perpetuated and protected against the elements and ravages of time, that little log building on the banks of the Niagara River, on September 17, 1792, that the first Speaker was chosen. Therefore, we have traditions in connection with that office going back to the very dawn of our history up to the present modern Ontario.

Mr. Clerk, it is a very great privilege and honour to place in nomination before this honourable Assembly, for the speakership during the life of this Parliament, the name of Alfred Wallace Downer, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Clerk, honourable Prime Minister and members of the Legislature: when a Speaker who has served for two full terms in the Legislature, lays down the mantle of authority which he has wielded during that time, it is fitting we should call to mind some of the great services he has rendered to the province in his capacity of Speaker, on the one hand, and almost of "Mr. Host" on the other. We believe, as members of the Legislature, that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has been a very estimable host during his term of office. We believe, also, that he has discharged his responsibilities as Speaker of the Legislature in a very capable manner. There were times, of course, when he read the rules in words not as we would have read them, and when his interpretations were somewhat different to those we should have placed upon the matter under discussion, but that, of course, is symbolic of the Speakership in a British Parliament. It is not always his lot to rule in favour of everybody in one ruling; it just cannot be done.

But in spite of the shortcomings which were probably less in him than they would have been in others, he has

discharged his responsibilities in a very capable manner.

We believe, as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested to the House, that after a Speaker has served two full terms of the Legislatures, it is perhaps better for all concerned that the speakership should be changed, and a new man brought into the Chair.

It follows then that we have this afternoon to name a new Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister has placed in nomination the name of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe. I am going to second that nomination in the belief that the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe will make a good Speaker. It may be that in the months and years which lie ahead, when we have been subjected perhaps to adverse rulings on various occasions, I may have to alter the opinion which I presently hold, but, at the moment, I can say to the hon. Prime Minister that in his nomination of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, I am wholeheartedly in accord, and that as he steps into the Speaker's Chair of this Legislature, we can look for rulings which will be fair and impartial, and that he will uphold the dignity of his office and discharge the responsibilities which are his, in a fair and impartial manner.

Therefore, Mr. Clerk, I have very great pleasure in seconding the nomination by the hon. Prime Minister that Mr. Alfred Wallace Downer, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, be the Speaker of the Legislature for the ensuing term.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:  
Are there any further nominations?

(No response.)

There being no further nominations, I declare the nominations closed, and I also declare The Honourable Alfred Wallace Downer, to be duly elected to be Speaker of this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable gentlemen of the Legislature: I want to express to you my sincere thanks for



the honoured position to which you have elected me this afternoon. I can assure you that I fully realize the great responsibilities which go with this high office, and I can only tell you that I will endeavour to merit your confidence by carrying on the duties of this office to the best of my ability. It is with a deep sense of humility that I assume this high office.

The office of Speaker is one of the most ancient in democratic assemblies. Behind me is a tradition formed by honourable gentlemen in days gone by reaching back to the First Parliament of Upper Canada. We saw history revived today with the Fort Henry Guard wearing the uniforms of our soldiers who guarded our shores in the War of 1812.

Today I would like to express my appreciation to all those who in one way or another during all the years have contributed to our way of life. More particularly I would like to express my thanks and the appreciation of every member of this House to my immediate predecessor who graced this office for the past 7 years. He ruled with courtesy and dignity and I hope to follow in his footsteps, difficult as that task may be. I shall do my very best to maintain the traditions and the dignity of this office in a manner suitable to the position. I will try at all times to be fair and impartial. I will grant to every hon. member full latitude in all discussions and debates within the rules of the House. My highest aim will be to listen to your debates with interest and to your inquiries with kindness.

There are bound to be differences of opinion in the House. That is why we have a Parliament. Here representatives of different areas come to argue and debate and plan for the good of all. When there are differences of opinion, we should all remember that no one man is the custodian of all the good ideas. The man on the other side of the argument has just as much patriotism, just as much right to his views as you have. Let us try to speak and act in this House as we would like others to speak and act toward us. If each one tries to practise the golden rule, my task will

be easy. I know you will bear with me in my shortcomings and I am sure you will overlook some of my mistakes. For my part, I will be impartial in my decisions, seeking only to maintain justice and fairness and to grant equal rights to every member.

May I ask for your forbearance in my weaknesses and understanding in my rulings. It is my earnest prayer that Divine Guidance may be granted me in order that I may be enabled to bring some small added honour to this ancient and honourable office. I pledge my loyalty to our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth, and her chosen representative in this Province of Ontario, the Lieutenant-Governor.

May the Great Architect of the Universe lead, guide and bless us in all our deliberations.

I thank you, honourable gentlemen, very sincerely.

The House will now adjourn during pleasure.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor then re-entered the House, and took his seat upon the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfill the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the Assembly whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and their country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the Assembly to Her

Majesty's person and government, and not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow the constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the Assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all suitable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him, the most favourable construction.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

HON. L. O. BREITHAUP (Lieutenant - Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: You are here today to commence your duties as members of the Twenty-fifth Parliament of the Province of Ontario. I am happy to extend my greetings to each of you on this occasion.

At the time of the dissolution of the Twenty-fourth Parliament 3 Select Committees were dealing with the very important subject matters of Certificates of Title for Motor Vehicles, Smoke Control and Air Pollution, and Toll Roads. It is very desirable that these committees should be reconstituted and should continue with the work which was carried on by the committees in the previous Legislature. The work of these committees will give opportunity for the regular session of the Legislature to deal with important matters arising out of their deliberations. Motions will be presented to you dealing with these matters.

I express the wish that you will be guided by Divine Providence in your deliberations and decisions in regard to matters which will come before you in this Special Session and in sessions to be held in the Twenty-fifth Parliament of Ontario which will deal with matters of great importance to our province.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair. 3.45 p.m.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech which I will read.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the re-reading of the Speech by Mr. Speaker be dispensed with.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that I recognize Mr. Farquhar R. Oliver, the hon. member for Grey South, as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the proceedings, it is appropriate to introduce the customary Bill asserting the rights and position of the Legislature and this Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that during the present session of the Legislative Assembly provision be made for the taking and printing of reports of debates and speeches and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him; also that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports in the amount of 800 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, to the Legislative Library, to each member of the Assembly, to the Reference Libraries of the province, to the Press Gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the Assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege: as you no doubt are aware, Mr. Speaker, during the last election, I was the subject of considerable controversy over what has become known as the Drohan-Dempsey-McCann affair.



I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this House is entitled to a full explanation from me concerning this matter. But in view of the fact that this is a special sitting of the House, and that it will be very short, it is not my intention to make that explanation at this session.

It is my intention, however, to make a complete statement on the whole matter at the next regular session of the Legislature, at which time I am satisfied that I can show this House, that my position throughout has been legal and entirely proper in every sense of the word and that I will be completely vindicated before this House, and before the Bar of public opinion.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that as the Legislature has been convened in this Special Session for the purpose of considering certain matters which have been laid before you in the Address of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, the House hereby resolves to dispense with the customary formal debate on the subject matters of the Address as such matters may be debated during the consideration of the motions submitted to the House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should ask you to revert for a moment in the procedure, and not declare the motion carried, for this reason. In this proceeding today, we are following, in fact, the procedure which has been adopted in previous Special Sessions of the Legislature convened to deal with particular and specific matters, in which cases we have dispensed with what we familiarly call the "Throne Debate."

In convening the House, I think it would be altogether undesirable if the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the leader of the other Party, and perhaps other hon. members of the House, did not have the opportunity of calling to the attention of the Legislature matters of public and pressing interest and importance, so I have agreed, subject to the concurrence of the House, that the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for York South, if they desire, make reference to certain matters at this time. I may say that this is, in effect, a substitution for the debate on

the Speech from the Throne. On the other hand, it does not call for the formalities which are required on other occasions.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would leave it to the hon. members to address the House if they so desire.

Motion agreed to.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the procedure outlined by the hon. Prime Minister will be, I am sure, acceptable to all hon. members of the House.

Actually, this is a Special Session of the Legislature called for the specific purpose of reorganizing 3 Select Committees, but, as the hon. Prime Minister has intimated, it would be somewhat unfortunate if, at the first Session of this Legislature, there was any doubt as to the right of any member to question the government, if you will, on matters of policy, and things which have transpired during the interval between the last session of the Legislature and the present time.

I do not intend to speak at any length. I do, however, want to ask the government to make its position clear in regard to two important public matters. I am quite sure, from what the hon. Prime Minister has said, that he will welcome the opportunity to lay before the House, and the province as a whole, a more clear explanation in respect to these matters than has been heretofore forthcoming.

The first one to which I wish to direct my attention has to do with the question of unemployment. Hon. members of the last Parliament will recall there was considerable discussion on unemployment in the last session of that Legislature, and there was a feeling on the part of many that the Province of Ontario should have worked hand-in-hand with the municipalities, in a financial sense, in caring for the unemployed, and that there should have been a financial arrangement with the municipalities whereby the problem of taking care of some of the financial commitments for that purpose should have been arrived at.

Since the last session of the Legislature, there have been discussions, as I recall it, in Ottawa on this very subject, and there was an intimation in the Press that the Federal Government had made a proposal, and had laid that proposal before the provincial governments. If my memory serves me correctly, that proposal was not acceptable to the Ontario Government.

The proposal was, as I recall it, for the Federal Government to share the costs for the purpose of unemployment relief. I think this afternoon the hon. Prime Minister might place before the House the position of the Government of Ontario in relation to this matter. Is there any hope which can be held out to the municipalities of this province, that the province will share in the financial commitments for this purpose? Is there an understanding that the province will co-operate with the Federal Government in attacking this problem?

I would like the hon. Prime Minister to give some thought to the answer, because I think he will agree with me, it is something which has the people guessing, the people are not sure of the answer, and now is the time, when we are met here in session, to give the facts, so that all may see and understand them.

The other matter has to do with what is called the "Trans-Canada Pipe Line."

From the discussions which have taken place up until now in respect to the gas pipe line supposed to feed gas from Alberta to the rest of Canada, as I understand it, the main line carrying the gas across Canada was a Federal responsibility, and a Federal commitment. That was our understanding when the last session of the Legislature progressed.

Subsequently to that, there have been stories in the Press which would seem to indicate that there has been a change in the proposed financing of the Trans-Canada Pipe line, and lately it has been suggested in the Press, under an Ottawa date line, that the Province of Ontario and the Province of Alberta were going to share the cost in the amount of some

\$100 million, for this line in the northern part of the Province of Ontario.

If that is the case, and if the government has gone so far as to commit the province in that respect, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is proper and timely that the hon. Prime Minister should set out before the House this afternoon just what has transpired, and just what the picture seems to be in relation to getting gas from Alberta to the central part of Canada.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the last intimation we had was there was no commitment on the part of the Province of Ontario. Now it appears that in connection with a certain section of northern Ontario, with difficult terrain, where a line is expensive to build, and not attractive to the company which is to build it, that the provincial governments of Ontario and Alberta have agreed to take on the heavy load, as it were, and sign their names to bonds which would permit of the financing of this undertaking.

When the hon. Prime Minister is discussing it, he might suggest to the House, if he will if, for the moment, Alberta is not willing to participate in this deal, if it does not intend to go ahead with its part of the undertaking, is it the intention of the Ontario Government to take up Alberta's share, and carry one-half the cost of construction of the line in the north country?

These are two things to which I would like to have the hon. Prime Minister direct his attention for a few moments, if he will.

MR. DONALD MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my congratulations to you on your election to your high office.

The incidence of Conservative members in this Legislature has reached almost epidemic proportions. But the burden upon those of us who do not belong to that Party, will be lightened by the fact that you have been chosen



as the one to preside over the deliberations of the House. We in this group are looking forward to working with you in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for the opportunity he has afforded us to raise some of the issues which have emerged since the last session of the Legislature. I think it would have been a serious mistake to have a meeting of this Legislature—even a special session, which I am told, traditionally deals only with specified matters—without an opportunity to discuss some current public issues. That is particularly true at this time when some of the issues which have arisen in the last few months are so important. Indeed I think they are some of the most important issues which have been faced by this province and its people in the last few years.

Such a time-honoured champion of legislatures as Sir Winston Churchill has often said that statements of policy, when a legislature is meeting or is about to meet, should always be made in the legislature, rather than outside. Sir Winston has even gone to the extent of criticizing a debate on the British Broadcasting Corporation regarding an issue which was about to come before the British Parliament, in the belief that Parliament is the place in which these issues should arise, and hon. members should participate to the fullest extent in the formulating of policy.

Personally, if I may be so bold in my maiden speech in this House, I would like to express the view that this Province of Ontario—as the hon. Prime Minister so often assures us—has grown to such an extent that today we have a budget equal to the Federal budget in the early thirties. I suggest we have outgrown the tradition of holding special sessions which meet for only a few hours when the business of the province has to be crammed into a normal session limited to only seven or eight weeks.

I do not propose to speak at length this afternoon, but there are three topics—two of which the hon. leader of the Opposition has already raised—upon which I would like to touch.

The first is the matter of the pipe line to bring natural gas from Western Canada to supplement the inadequate energy resources of the central part of this nation. The fact is beyond dispute that in the last two or three years the pipe line promoters of this nation have sold the country a false bill of goods. They have stated from the outset that it was possible to build a pipe line across Canada on a free-enterprise basis.

It is now evident that they are unwilling or unable to do that. Therefore they have gone back to the respective governments, and we are now faced in the legislatures of the various provinces, as well as the Federal Government, with working out alternative proposals to cope with this situation.

With the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would welcome a statement from the hon. Prime Minister as to exactly what the situation is, because our only information is what we have been able to glean from the public Press. It would appear that the free-enterprise promoters are unwilling or unable to cope with what, for this nation, has always been a major problem, namely, bridging the thousand-mile gap of northern Ontario. Certainly this is of vital importance for the Province of Ontario.

The suggestion now is that this gap can be filled only by a public corporation. Whether it is going to be a public corporation in which the Federal Government, with one, two or more of the provinces participating, we do not know. It is on that question we would like some clarification. But it appears obvious that we can now assume that the only solution for bridging northern Ontario is a public corporation.

If that is so, Mr. Speaker, I think it raises another point to which I trust this government will give some consideration, because I do not think it is too late to do so. I think the principle which is now emerging in the alternative solution is an absolutely indefensible principle. The proposition that, in developing the natural resources of this nation and this province, that portion of the development which may be profitable should be handed over to private enterprise, while

that portion of it which will not be profitable—either now or at some later date—will be taken over by public enterprise, I feel personally—and I am sure the public feels—is absolutely indefensible. The public purse takes the risk and private operators gather the profits. I am certain there are a great many people in all parties who will acknowledge that this is an indefensible principle. If it is, Mr. Speaker, I raise the question as to whether or not—since at least a fair-sized portion of the line within the geographical area of the Province of Ontario is likely to be handled by a public corporation — this government could be persuaded to review its decision taken a year ago, so that the distribution system within the province might be handled as a publicly-owned corporation something on the pattern of Hydro.

At the time this was being discussed in the House by the hon. Minister who is now Provincial Treasurer—because of the game of musical chairs in the summer of the cabinet ministers, I have difficulty keeping up-to-date with portfolios—two or three statements were made which I suggest we look at now.

The first one was that it would be unfair to bring natural gas into the Province of Ontario at a price sharply competitive with existing fuels. I think that is an amazing statement.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member would refer to the exact statement.

MR. MacDONALD: I will take pleasure in referring to it many times, Mr. Speaker, but I have not the exact quotation at the moment.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member refer to it by date and paragraph?

MR. MacDONALD: With pleasure. I cannot do so at the moment, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have given what I feel to be the exact interpretation of what he stated when the hon. Minister was introducing the Bill to establish the Fuel Board—that it would be

unfair to bring natural gas into this province at a cost which would be sharply competitive with existing fuels.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I could not have said that gas cannot be sold unless it has competition.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister should not be so certain that he did not make that statement. Let the matter rest for the moment. When we check the record, we shall find out whether or not it was said.

The point I want to raise now is that the basic economics of this proposition in regard to the pipe line are that if we do not get natural gas at the cheapest possible price, it will not become an economical fuel in this province. It has to be sharply competitive to get into the market.

HON. MR. PORTER: I have said that a dozen times.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps you have. But the policy which the government has adopted is inevitably going to increase the cost of natural gas, because there is just no argument against the fact that if you have a privately-owned corporation, its capital costs will be considerably higher; that the amortization period will be shorter, thus raising costs again. Finally, a public corporation would be exempt from paying taxes—an exemption which is desirable if we are to get natural gas at the cheapest possible price.

If this pipe line is to go through northern Ontario where this new source of energy is greatly needed, privately-owned local distribution companies cannot develop a local market when the cost will be such that no householder is going to change over in his home, when no industrialist is going to change over in his industry, and no new industry can be attracted because the price will not be lower than existing power costs. Government policy in favour of private enterprise has reduced the possibility of building gas as another source of fuel in this province.



There will be many other occasions during our regular session to discuss this issue, but I raise it now because it seems to me that when the present hon. Provincial Treasurer introduced this, one of the reasons that he gave for deciding to hand over the distribution system to private enterprise was that private operators were going to handle the trunk line, the trans-Canada pipe line and it would not be wise to mix public and private enterprise.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had better be sure.

MR. MacDONALD: I am sure of it, Mr. Speaker. Now that we are going to have the pipe line built in part by a public corporation, involving Federal and provincial governments, I repeat I hope that the government might give reconsideration to the building of the distribution system in the province by a public corporation. In other words, a vast distributive network across this province comparable to Hydro, which has done a good job, in part, because it is a public corporation.

The second point I want to raise which was not touched upon by the hon. leader of the Opposition was the question of health insurance. We are going to have a Federal-Provincial conference this fall in which we are led to believe that the issue of health insurance is going to be on the agenda.

Once again we have no alternative but to engage in a great guessing match as to exactly what the situation is. This issue—which is one of the most important issues before the people of the Province of Ontario and this nation—has been subject for generations to procrastination and propaganda, instead of action.

I notice spokesmen for the government are saying that the Liberals first promised health insurance in 1919. I think it is time for us to remember that in 1943 this government was elected on the promise of providing "health coverage for all of us." They are just as guilty of procrastination.

It has been stated very definitely by the hon. Premier of the Province of Quebec that they are not going to enter into this kind of plan. When the hon. Prime Minister raised this question last spring and tried to get it on the agenda of the Federal-Provincial Conference, spokesmen for the Federal Government refused to put "Health Insurance" on the agenda. They only agreed to "Health and Welfare Matters." In other words, we are still engaged in procrastination. So far the Federal Government is concerned they will continue to procrastinate until one of the central provinces is willing to show its intentions and good faith by moving on this issue instead of just talking about it. Therefore I would urge the hon. Prime Minister that if he is interested in getting health insurance for the people of the Province of Ontario, he will get the ball rolling not by engaging in a "buck-passing" game with Ottawa, but by setting up a provincial hospital scheme as the first major step towards establishing overall health-insurance. Such hospital plans have been adopted in two other provinces, one, at least, of which has been highly successful. We do not need to do the pioneering. That has been done. It is simply a task of adapting a plan to Ontario's particular needs and conditions.

The third point I want to raise is the question of unemployment assistance, which will also come before the Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa a short time hence.

Once again we are left guessing as to the exact position of the Ontario Government, and, again with the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would hope that we can get some clarification of this so that public discussion of it could be more intelligent and more realistic.

From my information—which I think is accurate—the Government of the Province of Ontario has at least given serious consideration, if it has not in fact decided, to "sit out" this offer which has been made by the Federal Government on unemployment assistance.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in the strongest possible terms that I think if the Government of Ontario "sits out" this offer made by the Federal Government on unemployment assistance, it will be doing a profound disservice not only to the nation as a whole, but to the Province of Ontario. I want to say briefly why I think that is the case.

There is perhaps no more deplorable and shameful aspect of the public record of this nation than that over the last 20 years we have drifted on such an important issue as unemployment assistance. Who is responsible for meeting the basic needs of a person who happens to be out of work? Which level of government is responsible? How are the costs to be shared?

We had the grim experience of the 'thirties. Employment picked up during the War, so we forgot the problem and we have drifted since then. The government's stand, insofar as I have been able to get details, is that the proposal which has been offered by the Federal Government in Ottawa today is a pale shadow of the proposal that the Federal Government made in 1945, and therefore is in many respects an unsatisfactory one.

I agree with the government on this point,—that the proposal which is being made today is a pale shadow of what was offered in 1945. This is regrettable. I think this proposal, and what the Federal Government has done with regard to it in the last 10 years, is little short of a "betrayal" because the Federal offer on unemployment assistance in 1945 was really part of the whole financial arrangements involving the tax rental agreements.

However, I think it is time this government, instead of deploring the fact that this is just a poor substitute of what was offered in 1945, reminded itself that this nation did not secure an agreement regarding unemployment assistance 10 years ago was because this government, with others, walked out of the conference.

HON. MR. PORTER: No.

MR. MacDONALD: If they did not walk out, at least they refused to enter into the agreement.

MR. H. NIXON (Brant): And whose chickens have come home to roost, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, their chickens have come home to roost, and the Province of Ontario is today paying for the scuttling of the conference 10 years ago by its own delegation.

It seems to me today it would be a tragic development if this government should go to Ottawa, and repeat what it did in 1945, by not entering into an agreement.

Let me emphasize again, I do not for one moment say that this government should not go to Ottawa, and bargain as hard as possible. We know from long experience with the government at Ottawa, that they must be kicked, and cajoled and bludgeoned before they do anything. This Ontario Government is perhaps the only government that it is even harder to get anything out of. But on this occasion, I am with the Ontario Government when it gets down to its hard bargaining. However, we should not lose sight of the goal of getting some sort of agreement—the best possible agreement—so that the uncertainty of the last 20 years unemployment assistance will be ended. At any time in the future, we shall have the opportunity of reviewing any agreement signed now.

My final point in connection with why I think it would be a grave disservice not only to this nation, but to this province, if, after the hardest possible bargaining, we do not come to some agreement, is that there are no benefits for Ontario in the proposals now offered.

What are the proposals? Very briefly—that when unemployment goes above .45 of one per cent. of the population, the Federal Government will share in the cost of assistance to the extent of 50 per cent.

Now, what is .45 per cent. of our population? It represents about 25,000.



The latest figures we have in regard to unemployment, in July of this year—and I suggest this may be a rock-bottom figure for the foreseeable future,—shows that according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics there were 36,000 people out of work, while according to the National Employment Service figures there were 72,800 who had made applications for jobs.

Now we come to the problem as to which figure is the accurate one. The truth may be found to lie somewhere in between. If that be so, we have between 50,000 and 60,000 people of this province who are unemployed; in other words, double the 25,000 which .45 per cent. represents,—well beyond the point where the Federal Government is willing to “come through” with assistance to the extent of 50 per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out that the Federal proposal is subject to the means test, which would be imposed by the municipalities. Because people are out of work, does not necessarily mean they are entitled to anything. Those figures are meaningless. In other words, it is the case load which would apply after the application of the means test.

MR. MacDONALD: The tragedy is we did not get an agreement in 1945 for it would have included standards of benefits, so we would know exactly where we stood. Now we have to make a new start with the proposals of 1955. That is why I am raising this question this afternoon. What we want now is something for the unemployed of Ontario. It is desperately urgent, necessary and desirable that we should have some sort of a plan, so the unfortunate drifting of the last 25 years in regard to this important issue will not continue.

If the Provincial Government is not willing to obligate itself to a share of unemployment assistance, let it enter an agreement so that it can collect the 50 per cent. from the Federal Government and hand it over to the municipalities. At least, their load would be cut in half.

These are the 3 points I wanted to raise, and I leave them with the hope that we may get some clarification from the government so henceforth we can discuss these issues more knowledgeably.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in response to the queries which have been directed to me by the hon. members who have spoken, may I say that I am not without notice of these questions. Both hon. members were good enough to raise the points with me, and to point out they would like to raise these matters here this afternoon, and, therefore, I have had the opportunity of trying to condense into reasonable compass the answers to the queries which are very, very broad indeed. Full discussion on these 3 subjects would take a very great deal of time. I do wish to thank the hon. members for telling me in advance, and thus giving me the opportunity of reducing the reply to a form which would be reasonable in compass and not take too much of the time of the House on this occasion.

I have listened to the hon. members. They have addressed these questions which I think are perfectly proper. I quite agree that this is a meeting of the representatives of the people, and it was perfectly proper that these matters should come before the House for consideration.

I am not so sure that the time may not come when perhaps there will be a session in the fall and one in the spring, rather than simply the traditional spring session. I think perhaps that day is not far off. I have thought that perhaps in our regular sessions we compress too much work into a short period of time, and that it might be better to spread the work out. However, that is for consideration at a time other than this.

I may say that these questions which have been directed to me have been clothed, of course, in the impressions which the hon. members wanted to convey. I cannot find fault with the presentation of the questions by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not think his questions carried any inferences at all.

But that is hardly true in regard to the hon. member for York South, who inferred that I had been a "stifler of the conferences." I stand before this House today, and before the people of the province, as one who has not been a "stifler of conferences," but, in fact, has been one who has tried to spark success into all the conferences we have had.

I will say to the hon. member for York South that if he will go back into the story of Confederation, and the history of our country since 1867, he will find many blind ends and many blank walls which have been met by various governments, but our approach has always been to try and get all governments, regardless of political affiliations and connections, to work together, and make progress. I can come before this House today with a record of progress in that regard which is unparalleled in the history of our governments.

May I say further to the hon. member for York South that he can rest assured, if anybody can bring anything out of any of these conferences, this government can.

Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with the 3 questions which have been raised, and I will ask the indulgence of the House notes I have prepared, which was done for the purpose of making the explanations as concise and as short as possible. These are great subjects.

In the matter of Hospital Insurance which has been variously referred to as "Health Insurance" and "Hospital and Health Insurance," may I point out that the subject has been discussed now for very many years in Canada and it was very specifically raised in the Dominion-Provincial Conference of 1945. That there are difficulties must be very clearly recognized. We have 10 provinces and the Federal Government. Among the provinces there are widely differing views on this subject and there are widely differing conditions with which to deal. To evolve a plan by agreement upon which all provinces may proceed in whole or in part is not an easy task. Then again the financial implications are very huge. It is, of course, true that a hospital insurance plan would transfer

to the various treasuries costs which are presently being borne by individuals, but nonetheless it would not relieve individuals of paying for the service. Payment of premiums and other charges would have to be resorted to, including, no doubt, payroll and other deductions.

It is idle to think these things can be done without payments.

Governments would be left with the problem of raising other sums from general taxation and while it is, of course, a fact that individuals would be relieved of charges that they are already making to hospitals, the transference of this obligation to governments would be a very huge financial operation indeed. This would involve in our province at least \$200 million, and probably much more. This must be recognized by our people. These very difficulties no doubt have postponed the consideration of this question which I felt, as head of the Government of Ontario, should be placed upon the agenda for the Federal-Provincial Conference which was convened on April 27 last.

May I read to the House exactly what I said to the conference in relation to Health Insurance and Federal Health grants:

This very important subject deserves the consideration of this conference. It is a matter which has been widely discussed and this conference can do a great deal to clarify the issues involved.

May I point out to the hon. member for York South that to have these complicated questions resolved, they have to be placed before bodies for consideration. I think the time for making nebulous promises and statements has passed, and the time has come to place these things clearly before the people so they can all be understood.

It is generally recognized that any health insurance plan of a broad nature should have both Federal and provincial participation. We suggest that the whole question be intensively studied, with a view to arriving at the following:



(a) A health insurance plan in which there would be both Federal and provincial participation and in which the fullest details of the extent of the coverage to the individual would be given.

(b) Estimates as accurate as possible of the cost of such a plan and how that cost would be shared—

- (i) By the individual or family;
- (ii) By the provincial government;
- (iii) By the Federal Government.

(c) How the moneys to support such a plan would be raised.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that it would have to be considered in the light of the problems and fiscal position of Canada and her provinces.

(d) In what manner and under what conditions a health plan could be proceeded with in stages in accordance with the medical and hospital organization and the financial position of each province.

I think we have learned in these conferences—

and I am quoting from the report—

—that the provinces cannot all be put into one mould. Canada is just not made that way.

(e) In the stages suggested in (d), what priority could be given to meeting the crippling financial burdens imposed on the individual and family by prolonged illness and affliction.

(f) In what way the plans established by individual provinces could be integrated into a Federal-provincial health insurance plan.

Those, Sir, are the 6 points we would like to submit, in no dogmatic fashion, to this conference.

And I went on to say:

The study of health insurance would help to clarify the thinking of all in a field in which there unquestionably is a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion. A plan could be evolved in this way that would enable the whole structure to be built efficiently and within the

financial capacities of the various levels of government in stages to pay for it. Health insurance has many important financial implications, not only for the provinces and the Federal Government but for the individual; and since it is one of the great objectives in the field of human betterment, it should be placed on the agenda for study, with a view to producing a sound, workable plan with which we could proceed.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South will both agree with that statement.

I also pointed out that there should be:

Revision of the present Federal health grants to allow more flexibility in their use.

The Federal health grants established in 1948 have undoubtedly served a very valuable purpose. Unfortunately, however, as they are earmarked for certain specific purposes, none of the provinces has been able to make as full use of them as it would like. As conditions vary from province to province, it inevitably follows that a specific conditional grant that would be suitable in one province would not be suitable in another. The restrictions on the use of grants have diminished their value, not only to Ontario but indeed to all provinces. We should, therefore, like to see the basis of these grants re-examined and a more flexible system devised that will carry out the objectives of the Federal Government and at the same time be better suited to meeting the particular needs of the people of each province.

That is the proposal placed before the conference.

May I comment on this by saying that we have been working very intensively on this subject for many months past, indeed going back to the summer of 1954. We propose to submit to the conference which will be re-assembling next month, a plan for full hospital coverage and also various steps and

stages which might be used in its implementation. It is our intention to submit these matters to the conference so that they may be intensively studied, with the hope that from them and from the views and ideas expressed by other provinces and governments that we may be able to evolve a plan which will be acceptable, and which will be flexible enough to meet the requirements of our broad country where we have many and varying conditions and also a plan which is sound from a financial standpoint, and will be within the capacity of our people to support because again I say that these matters have to be translated into our tax structure, and we cannot and must not do things which will add to our tax burden to the extent that we cannot do the things necessary for the development of the country and the increase of the productivity of our people, and which would militate against the sale of our goods in the markets of the world. It must always be remembered that it is our ability to produce and sell that gives us ability to maintain and expand our stand of living.

That is the comment I want to make in connection with health insurance or health and hospital insurance. I will keep the House and the people informed of the progress we make on that subject, when we meet on October 3.

In connection with Unemployment Relief and Assistance:

The Federal and provincial positions have been widely reported and commented upon in the Press.

I am bound to say I cannot regard the Federal proposals with anything but misgiving. They are a reversal of the lessons which we learned in the 'thirties. The proposals fall a very long way short of meeting the requirements or what might reasonably be expected from the proposals made by the Government of Canada in 1945-46 to assume 100 per cent. responsibility for the unemployed employables, while the provinces and their municipalities would look after unemployables.

The formula submitted by the Federal Government will saddle the provinces

and the municipalities with the responsibility for, and the cost involved in, providing assistance and relief—I put it in the form of “relief” because that is what it is—for unemployable persons, and at the same time force upon them a major share of the cost of supplying direct relief to indigent, able-bodied employable persons as well as the problem of administration. In short, under the Federal formula there is a retreat from the position which came about because of the lessons of the 1930's in which this and other provinces had a problem which they had every reason to believe was not theirs.

The Federal Government in 1941 obtained an amendment to the British North America Act enabling it to establish a system of unemployment insurance. This amendment was soundly conceived. It was based on experiences of the 1930's which nearly brought ruin to the provinces and their municipalities. In fact, some of the provinces and municipalities still have obligations outstanding as a result of relief payments made to able-bodied persons 20 years ago. We cannot contemplate with anything but dismay the prospect of reverting to a system which in these enlightened days we thought we had left in the past—a system which was unsatisfactory and objectionable not only to the provinces and the municipalities, but to those who, because of their lack of means, were obliged to accept its benefits.

The history of the 1945 proposals by the Federal Government is as follows:

We in Ontario accepted the constitutional amendment of 1941 in good faith. As a matter of fact, the hon. members opposite were in power at that time, and the present hon. leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Welfare. One of his first acts was to pass the necessary regulations and amendments providing for the abolition of the payments of relief to employable persons. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition—the then Minister of Welfare—felt that it was an obligation which was no longer ours. In any event, we accepted it as



such, and I think we had good reasons for so doing.

A Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial relations known as the Sirois Commission in its report in 1940 declared:

The Dominion is the only government which can meet, in an equitable and efficient manner, the large fluctuating expenditure due to unemployment. . . . The experience of the past decade is conclusive evidence that unemployment relief should be a Dominion function.

By unemployment relief, it meant relief or aid for unemployed employables as distinct from unemployables. The same report felt that the provinces and municipalities should take care of the unemployable, and that is what we have been doing in Ontario.

In 1943, a report on Social Security for Canada prepared by Dr. L. C. Marsh at the instance of the Federal Government and presented to the House of Commons by the late Honourable Ian Mackenzie, declared that the logical location for the administration of relief or aid to employable persons was the Federal Employment Services or some branch of it. He pointed out that there were a number of compelling reasons which made unemployment assistance additional to unemployment insurance necessary and that one of the strong reasons for considering this unemployment assistance anew was—to quote from the report:

the inadequate and repellent character of the relief measures of the past.

At the Dominion-Provincial Conference in 1945 the Federal Government proposed as a sound and logical plan that it establish a system of unemployment assistance for able-bodied unemployed persons who have no benefit rights under the Unemployment Insurance Act and that the provinces assume responsibility for persons who cease to be employable. To Ontario this seemed and still seems the sound and reasonable division of responsibility and, therefore, we deplore the present Federal proposal

as a retrograde step which constitutes a throwback to the objectionable system of the 1930's.

May I point out that Ontario and its municipalities are confronted, and will be confronted, with the coming years, with an increase in expenditures for essential services that will surpass anything that has gone before. We shall be faced with the necessity of at least doubling our educational facilities and staffs. The municipalities must undertake costly works to increase water supply, sewer and sanitation facilities. The Federal Government is even now asking us to engage in plans for the abatement of pollution as a result of Ontario's industrialization, which also happens to be one of the Federal Government's principal sources of revenue. The rapidly rising demand for electrical power, new hospitals, extended highways, municipal roads, new schools and public buildings, which are to some extent due to the failure to meet these requirements in the 1930's, is going to be expanded.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem which faces us.

Our municipal assistance has grown, because of necessity, over a period of a dozen years from \$18 million to \$165 million. These are all things which add to Federal revenue, our national product and to the wealth of our people.

I was interested in a speech by Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, which he delivered at Edmonton, where he said that gross national products of Canada would exceed the estimated \$25 billion. The "gross national product" is the sum total of what is being accomplished in the provinces in the way of industry. We have here in Ontario contributed through the mighty works on the St. Lawrence River, the great construction and public building, highways construction and other industry. The activities and undertakings of the provinces contribute to that sum of money.

If we render it impossible for the provinces and their municipalities to do this job, we are curtailing expansion and production.

The Federal proposals in brief are that the provinces and the municipalities

should continue to support the unemployables, and to the extent that unemployables and unemployed employables exceed .45 per cent. of our population the Federal Government will then share in 50 per cent. of the cost.

At the present time, we have very heavy employment in the province and the ratio of unemployed to total labour forces is less than  $1\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.

The hon. members opposite over-looked that point.

On a means test, which would be required under the Federal proposals our total unemployment would be definitely under .45 per cent. There, therefore, is no Federal contribution involved at the present time. The new proposals in fairness to the municipalities could not possibly come into effect before January 1 when the new budgets would become effective in the municipalities.

I want to say this as a word of warning; it is a very great mistake to think that such a plan will work equitably in Ontario. It cannot possibly do so. With only .45 per cent. unemployment in the province, we could have one portion of the province enjoying very high employment and other places in the province having very considerable unemployment problems with no Federal contribution at all.

We had that situation last winter.

The system, therefore, could operate as a grave injustice both to municipalities and the provinces. The burden of relief load will vary greatly as between municipalities as will the varying practices of the different municipalities in dealing with this problem.

We have that wide variation, as the hon. members know, with the problem of dealing with the unemployables. While we set the standards, it does not necessarily follow that the municipalities will adhere to those standards, and that same condition will be met in dealing with the unemployed employables, which I think is bound to create nothing but dissatisfaction, difficulties and objectionable situations, such as existed in the 1930's.

I cannot think that this reversion to what the Marsh report of 1943 referred to as "the inadequate and repellent character of the relief measures of the past," can produce any satisfaction. The views that I now express I have stated on other occasions.

And I am not any more emphatic today than I was at the conference last June, in asserting that this situation would not work.

I do want to give credit to Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent for his efforts to recognize some of the points which we have raised. I think their original percentage level was entirely unrealistic; compared to that, I think the .45 per cent. level is more realistic. Some of the other things which were introduced into the matter—for instance, the acceptance of the 50 per cent. formula which was not in the original formula—are indeed more realistic, but, with all that, I asserted to the representatives at that time that this plan could not give satisfaction.

While disagreeing with the principle, may I say that if we are called upon to assume 50 per cent. of what all authorities considered was the Federal problem, namely looking after the unemployed employables, it would be equitable for the Federal Government to come into our sphere and assume 50 per cent. of our cost of the unemployables, which runs around \$6 million a year for the province and municipalities. From the standpoint of administration that would solve many of the difficulties with which we are going to be faced with the other formula. It hardly seems fair that we should bear all of the burden of the unemployables and then take more than 50 per cent. of the Federal end of things, not including cost of administration and medical and other costs. We advanced this at the conference without success and in lieu of the Federal Government assuming 50 per cent. of our costs, i.e. for the unemployables, that they should give to the provinces an unconditional subsidy of say 50 cents per head of population, which in Ontario's case would amount to about \$2½ million. Such a move, while not producing the



ultimate in desirability, would at least have been very much fairer than the present proposal. We deplore the present proposals in the face of all the lessons Canada learned in the depression days.

In the meantime may I point out that in the last session of the Legislature the amount of \$3¾ million was voted to the municipalities to provide for relief work or payments to unemployed persons in the discretion of the municipalities. In any event nothing is payable until January 1, since the Federal proposals could not come into effect until January 1 next. In the meantime thorough study is being given to the whole situation, so that it can be considered in connection with the fiscal position of the provinces of Canada which will be dealt with at the conference to be resumed next month. The unemployment matter is a segment of that great problem which will be commenced to be intensely studied and examined on October 3 next. It seemed to us that this is a very unsatisfactory solution which is not going to provide satisfaction to persons who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed and which is going to throw undoubted burdens and difficulties on the provinces and on the municipalities. This will have to be considered in the light of the whole situation which will be examined at that time.

In regard to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line:

We unhesitatingly believe that an all-Canadian gas pipe line is a national requirement. It is not necessary here to elaborate upon the great addition this would bring to Canada's economic strength. In our own province it would greatly add to the possibilities of northern Ontario, and as well the whole province. One of the hon. members mentioned the great source of wealth to be found in northern Ontario if there are the means of development, and the addition of a gas pipe line, added to the power and other resources, would have a tremendous effect on Canada. It would be a great step in a national field policy which is greatly needed in

our country. We, therefore, concurred entirely with the Federal Government proposal that the proposed pipe line should be placed entirely within Canada and follow a course through northern Ontario. The present course which is being discussed would follow the line of Highway No. 17 through Hearst to the Lakehead country and through the settled portion of that part of the province.

We hasten to express our desire to co-operate in every possible way. The hon. Mr. Porter, with the assistance of the hon. Minister of Mines has been in charge of such negotiations as have been held, and under his direction The Ontario Fuel Board has been created under the chairmanship of Mr. Crozier.

This is a matter of very great complication involving at least 5 of the Canadian provinces and the Federal Government and very numerous private interests engaged either in the production of gas in the west or the distribution of gas in the central provinces and elsewhere. Early in 1955 we were informed that the Trans-Canada company could not raise the necessary funds to carry out the project. The negotiations have been carried on by the Federal Government. There have been no conferences involving representatives of all of the interests concerned, but we have had discussions with the Federal Government relative to certain aspects of the problem.

Presently we have before us a very general proposition. The hon. Provincial Treasurer would agree it is hardly a proposal. In fact it is not a proposal which we have before us at the present time, but an idea that perhaps some of the governments could participate in a company which might be termed a "bridge company" which would engage in the construction of a portion of the line in that part of Canada where it is difficult to build and maintain the line.

That does not mean if we were engaged in such a proposition that the government would take in the bad end and the other people would take in the good end, but it might be a method which could be adopted to take care of

some of the capital financing in the meantime.

May I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that we have signed nothing at all. There has not been anything to sign and there is nothing that I know of at the present time which we could sign. I can assure the hon. members of this House that neither I nor my colleagues will accept all the obligations and all the deficits and let someone else have all the cream and all the profits. That will not be the case. We have stated that if it could be shown that some project financed by the two governments—and again I say we have nothing definite—would solve the financial problems of the line and enable the Federal Government to carry out its national policy with respect to the same we would be willing to consider participation.

Perhaps I can say with the concurrence of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who is much more “hard-boiled” than I was when I was Treasurer, that we will not draw away the people’s money at all. We would be willing to consider participation and that is as far as we have gone. We expect to meet with the Federal authorities in Ottawa next week for a further discussion of the problem, and as yet we have no definite proposals to consider. We have not been parties to any negotiations that have taken place other than, as I have said, discussions with the Federal authorities. The hon. Treasurer, and his advisors in their studies of the problem have visited many points in Canada, we have taken the best advice that we could get in this matter and have had conversations with various governments and interests for the purposes of getting information, but these have not been in any sense negotiations but studies of the problem to give us the information upon which to base possible decisions in the future for our people. We believe in the desirability and necessity of a Canadian pipe line and express our willingness to participate in any practical, sensible way.

As I have stated, it is quite apparent that the negotiations under way are complicated and delicate. Beyond stat-

ing, as I have done, the announced policies of the two governments—Federal and Ontario—and our willingness to participate in any practical, sensible way and to consider proposals to this end from the Federal Government I do not think I should say anything more.

With that thought and that expression of policy we are prepared to sit in consultation with the Governments of Canada, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Quebec—because I think they come into this picture in a big way through the distribution of gas in Montreal. We are prepared to work out a deal which will bring this desired result to our country. I think that should be done without the necessity of subsidization, because it would appear to me that this project should pay for itself in the course of time.

If these answers which I have given on the subjects are the matters about which the hon. members asked me, the statements which I have given contain everything that I am prepared to say on this subject at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine existing legislation and practice in relation to the registration of conditional sales contracts and similar documents of title and pledge, particularly in connection with motor vehicles, and to consider ways of providing for a central registry for the said documents and for the issuance of certificates of title of ownership of motor vehicles.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.



Said committee to consist of 9 members and to be composed as follows:

Mr. Macaulay (chairman), Messrs. Warrender, Myers, Cathcart, Robarts, Letherby, Jolley, Gisborn and Wintermeyer.

HON. MR. FROST: The membership is identical with the addition of changes which resulted from the last provincial election.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: May I just explain to the hon. members of the House that committee was appointed about two years ago under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay). The committee brought in its report, and arising out of the report a draft bill was presented and given its first reading in the House so that it would become a matter of record.

There may be many hon. members of the House, including myself, who had grave doubts as to certain features of the Bill and the report, not as to its desirability, but as to the practical application here in the Province of Ontario. I would suggest to the hon. members of the House that they should procure the Bill and study it thoroughly.

I believe it was introduced by the hon. member for Riverdale, not with the intention that it should be passed, but that it would give a wide opportunity for the consideration of its provisions. The betterment of the registration of liens on motor vehicles particularly, and also on some other chattels, is highly desirable. It must be remembered that we presently have about one and one-half million motor vehicles on our roads and to establish the matter of title would mean that we are throwing on the present owners the obligation of arranging their titles. I am afraid many of them would be like myself, leaving it to the last moment and then find yourself in "hot water." I think we should very carefully consider the steps which would have to be taken, because in my opinion it is altogether desirable that we should have a much better registration system.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves, that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine existing legislation and practice in relation to smoke control and air pollution in Ontario with particular reference to the installation and maintenance of equipment to control smoke and air pollution and methods and ways of extending public information in connection therewith.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said committee to consist of 9 members as follows:

Mr. Cowling (chairman), Messrs. Brandon, Elliott, Kelly, Macaulay, Morningstar, Murdoch, Gordon and Thomas (Oshawa).

In relation to that motion, it is simply a re-enactment of a similar motion passed during the session last spring. It is in identical terms, and the membership is virtually the same.

May I point out that when that motion was introduced, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition asked what would happen if the House were dissolved. At that time, I gave an undertaking that if there was a dissolution, and the government was returned, at the earliest practical time I would ask the House to re-establish these committees.

At that time, I did not know there was going to be a provincial election. Of course, they happen. The House can be dissolved at any time. In theory—as with these motions here—there might be, under certain conditions, a dissolution, and, of course, that applied last spring.

As it happened, there was an election held, and the conditions applied to which

I have referred, and I am taking this opportunity of carrying out what I said would be done, that is, that these committees would be re-established.

This matter of air pollution and smoke nuisance is one which is important in our industrial province, and its importance is perhaps growing, and it is well for this committee to have the opportunity of reviewing the whole problem.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to study all matters relating to toll roads and to report on the application of the same to certain areas having regard to the needs of the Province of Ontario.

And that the Select Committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

Said committee to consist of 11 members as follows: Mr. Robarts (Chairman), Messrs. Auld, Root, Child, MacDonald, Jolley, Mackenzie, Manley, Reaume, Sandercock and Yaremko.

It is practically the same committee, with certain substitutions.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business referred to in the directive to the hon. members of

the Legislature, and in the Address by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

That is all the business we propose to lay before the Assembly, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to attend upon His Honour, and escort him into the Chamber, for the purpose of proroguing the session.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, and took his seat upon the Throne, and was pleased to deliver the following gracious speech:

HON. L. O. BREITHAUP (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly: it is now my duty to prorogue the First Session of the Twenty-fifth Parliament of Ontario.

In this Special Session you have adopted certain motions reconstituting committees which ceased to exist upon the dissolution of the Twenty-fourth Parliament. The work of these committees will enable an early deliberation by the Legislature of the important matters which they will have under consideration.

May I thank you for your attention to this important public business.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: it is the will and pleasure of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued, and this Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, retired.

The House prorogued at 5.23 o'clock, p.m.





# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Tuesday, January 31, 1956.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor .....                         | 3 |
| Entrance of Horses at Exhibitions Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, first reading ...    | 7 |
| Sympathy extended family late Mr. Dempsey,<br>Mr. Frost, Mr. Oliver, Mr. MacDonald ..... | 8 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost .....   | 9 |



# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

## DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE OF  
THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, HELD IN THE LEGISLATIVE  
ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,  
TORONTO, ONTARIO, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1956,  
ET SEQ.

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

Tuesday, January 31, 1956, being the first day of the Second Session of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of The Honourable Louis O. Breithaupt, Lieutenant-Governor, of the province.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met,

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of the province then entered the House and, being seated upon the Throne, was pleased to open the session by the following gracious speech.

HON. L. O. BREITHAUPT (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

I bid you welcome to this Second Session of the Twenty-fifth Legislature.

Since you met last September, Canada has been honoured by a visit from Her Royal Highness, the Princess Royal, and we are pleased to have been able to extend our hospitality to her here in our own provincial Capital.

It is a great pleasure to call to your attention the completion of a year in which new levels of employment, production and income have been reached. After a beginning which gave some cause for concern, economic conditions in Ontario experienced so rapid and so

strong a recovery that the output of goods and services in 1955 was nearly 10 per cent. above that for 1954, and some 5 per cent. above the previous record year of 1953. Mining, forestry, manufacturing and construction contributed to this expansion.

During the past year, Federal-provincial conferences were convened in April, June and October. Reports on these proceedings will be made to the Legislature. The principal matters affecting Ontario were:

(1) Federal-provincial fiscal arrangements to supersede those expiring March 31, 1957;

(2) Unemployment assistance to supplement unemployment insurance;

(3) The problem of farm marketing;

(4) A national plan of hospital insurance.

Consideration of all these matters by the Federal-Provincial Conference of Ministers, as well as by the Technical Advisory Committee, is continuing. It is a source of satisfaction that Ontario's proposal to establish a continuing com-

mittee of Federal and provincial technical officials was adopted by the conference unanimously and is now in operation.

Arising out of the conference on fiscal arrangements, the Federal Government last January 6 made certain proposals, the particulars of which will be tabled, as will also its proposals in relation to unemployment assistance. In order to deal with these arrangements, a special session of the Legislature will be convened later this year.

Progress towards the adoption of a national plan of hospital services was given a strong impetus when the Government of Ontario submitted its proposals to the Federal-Provincial Conference in April last and further amplified them at the conference in October. As a result of Ontario's efforts, health insurance was not only placed on the conference agenda, but a special committee was established to study Ontario's, the other provinces' and the Federal Government's proposals. This committee met in October and again last week. In consequence, more progress has been made on hospital insurance in the past year than in all the previous decades that this subject has been under consideration. The proposals made by Ontario and those received from the Federal Government will be placed before the Standing Committee on Health where they may be examined in detail and later presented to the members of this House for their fullest consideration. Legislation, involving the organization and administration of our hospitals and aimed at strengthening the foundations upon which such a plan can be proceeded with, will be placed before the House at this session. In addition, measures affecting sanatoria for consumptives and public health will also be introduced.

At Ontario's suggestion, farm marketing was placed upon the Federal-Provincial Conference agenda. All the provinces have been filled with uncertainties—uncertainties that have persisted over many years—as to their constitutional jurisdiction on this important matter. We have deemed it wise

to have these doubts resolved. Accordingly, the Province of Ontario, in a wide reference, is submitting these questions to the Supreme Court of Canada. The earliest date for the hearing on this subject, which concerns all provinces, has been fixed for next April. In the meantime, intensive studies are being conducted into various alternatives pending the Supreme Court's decision. These studies are designed to give our farmers the legislation and support best suited to their marketing needs. Such enactments will require the consideration of the Legislature at a session to be held later this year. However, at this present session, measures will be introduced covering junior farmers' loans, brucellosis control, agricultural societies, co-operative marketing loans and seed potatoes.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is proceeding in accordance with plans approved by the Legislature. The carrying out of so large and complex a development inevitably creates dislocations affecting the lives of the people, the municipalities and businesses in that area. These problems are, however, being solved.

As work on the St. Lawrence project proceeds, the importance of the government's parks policy is becoming increasingly apparent. Legislation will be introduced providing for an integrated policy embracing the Niagara Parks, St. Lawrence Parks and other provincial parks throughout the province and for making available the necessary funds for such purposes on a long term basis. In this way, the orderly development of a province-wide parks system will be made possible.

The spectacular growth and development of Ontario has continued during the past year in many aspects on an accelerated basis. Very large problems of importance and complexity are continually arising because of our unprecedented advances. Last week, Ontario submitted its Brief to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. This Brief, which will be tabled in this House, reveals many of the opportunities as well as the challenges



which face our people over the coming years. One of these is the ever-growing demand for power. Since the inception of Ontario Hydro 50 years ago, the demand for electric power has increased annually except for two depression years. From 1933 onwards there has been a substantial annual increase, particularly since 1945. In the last decade alone, the commission's primary power requirements have considerably more than doubled. Furthermore, it is anticipated that this sharp upward trend will continue and that in the next 10 years the Commission's generating capacity will require to be doubled again. This means, therefore, that by 1965 we shall have to develop over 5 million horsepower more than is available today. We shall obtain approximately one quarter of this amount from the St. Lawrence development and a substantial part of the remainder will have to come from sources other than water power developments. Thus, we have turned to nuclear energy which, based upon our unrivalled uranium resources, affords immense potentialities.

In meeting these vast power requirements not only for the next 10 years but for the succeeding decade it is necessary to turn with all possible dispatch to bringing to our province natural gas and oil from western Canada. Legislation will be introduced enabling the Government of Ontario to advance \$35 million in capital to a Crown corporation for a natural gas pipe line through northern Ontario. Our partner in this will be the Federal Government. The building of an all-Canadian natural gas pipe line, will contribute immeasurably to the development of industry in northern and southern Ontario and in Canada generally. It will serve to reinforce the power and fuel supplies upon which our economic future depends.

Another vital need to assure Ontario's development is an abundance of water for industrial and domestic purposes, and coincidental with this the abatement and control of water pollution. Last year, the Ontario Water Supply and Resources Committee was set up. Its report has been printed as an appendix

to Ontario's submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects which, as stated, will be distributed. In further recognition of the importance of this work, legislation will be introduced creating in its place the Ontario Water Resources Commission which will have powers and be provided with funds to enable it, without delay, to make a vigorous start on water and pollution problems.

During the past year, notable advances have been made by our construction departments, including Highways, Public Works, and Planning and Development. The huge programme approved by this House at the last session has been carried out, except where shortages of steel and other materials and technical personnel have intervened. With the ever-strengthening of our administrative organization, an even larger capital programme will be submitted this year for your consideration in conformity with the needs of our people.

You will be asked to consider measures and vote estimates to facilitate the construction of highways, housing, conservation projects and other public works. Incompleted links of the Trans-Canada Highway will be pressed forward vigorously.

Highway safety—a matter of continental concern—has been receiving attention and action by the Departments of the Attorney-General and Highways during the past year. Provisions will be made for intensifying these efforts in the coming fiscal year.

The report of the Select Committee investigating toll roads will be presented for your study and consideration.

The reports of the committees investigating certificates of title for motor vehicles and smoke control and air pollution will also be received and considered.

My government has continually followed the policy of adding to the fiscal strength of our municipalities to enable them to meet their many requirements. For the first time, direct municipal representation was included in the Ontario delegation to the Federal-Provincial Conference. Among other things, the

form of metropolitan government in the Toronto area will be strengthened by transferring the police services to the metropolitan corporation and there will be a provision for a two-year term for all councils in this area to commence on January 1, 1957. The two-year term will enable bi-annual assessments and other improvements to be carried out that will reduce costs and add to the efficiency of local government.

For both the province and the municipalities, education will continue to be one of our most pressing problems. The school population is now over a million. The enrolment increase this year was nearly 70,000. Another 10 years will see approximately 1.6 million students in our primary and secondary schools. Our present position is favourable in that we have been able to keep abreast of the demands for increased accommodation. During the past year, as a result of nearly 500 building projects, over 2,300 additional elementary and secondary classrooms have been added to existing accommodation at a cost of nearly \$60 million. The task ahead is formidable and must be faced realistically. With the rapid upsurge of school population it will be more than ever necessary to restrict ourselves to essentials and provide the resources to pay for schools and engage adequate teaching staff without letting the burden upon the local taxpayers get out of hand. Last year's increase in provincial grants for education was the largest in a decade. The province's policy is being continued.

The betterment of human resources is one of our continuing objectives. Legislation will be introduced to provide for improvements in education and to extend the great objective of equality of opportunity. The development of skills and cultures is an important phase of our activities. The Department of Planning and Development's overseas facilities, including Ontario House at London, will be reinforced to assist people coming to Ontario. Through the work of adult education, new Canadians will become more quickly adjusted to the life of a new country. There will

also be new provisions for strengthening our welfare programme.

In our reform institutions, approaches are being made to the problems of drug and alcoholic addiction, sex deviates and neuro-psychiatric disorders. Honourable members will be asked to approve the continuation of the programme for extending training school facilities and for constructing dormitories and other buildings required in the treatment of incorrigible elements in our institutions.

Legislation will be introduced to continue our broad advances in the conservation and management of our resources of minerals, lands, forests, fish and wildlife, and water. Progress is being made in securing increased regeneration of spruce and red and white pine. During 1955 more than 57,000 mining claims were staked in Ontario—an increase of 14 per cent. above the unprecedented number in the previous year—striking evidence of the continued interest in mining activities in this province.

The Committee of Inquiry into the Economics of the Gold Mining Industry has completed its report and this will be distributed to you.

Honourable members will be asked to approve measures for reorganizing the Archaeological and Historical Sites Advisory Board under the Department of Travel and Publicity, and to authorize measures for fostering greater consciousness, both on the part of residents and visitors to Ontario, of this province's notable history by providing a better marking of historical sites and events.

In addition, legislation on many subjects of interest and concern to our people will be introduced. Bills will be presented to provide more assistance to private organizations operating welfare institutions and to extend child welfare services to children in all Indian Reserves in Ontario. There will be a Bill to establish the Department of Economics and a Bill to amend The Financial Administration Act. There will be amendments to The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, The Assessment Act, The



Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, The Municipal Act, The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, The Beach Protection Act, The Mining Act, The Power Commission Act, The Niagara Development Act, The St. Lawrence Development Act, The Department of Labour Act, The Public Health Act, The Highway Improvement Act, The Highway Traffic Act, The Crown Timber Act, The Forest Fires Prevention Act, and several other Acts providing for the improved management of land, forest and game and fish.

A Bill will be presented to establish, as a separate educational institution, the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology. There will be amendments to The Public Schools Act, The Secondary Schools and Board of Education Act, and The Separate Schools Act. Finally, numerous amendments will be made to legislation concerned with law enforcement.

The public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955, as well as a review of our financial operations for the current fiscal year and the Budget for the year commencing next April 1 will be submitted for your attention. Although these will bear witness to the province's sound financial operation, they will also bring home very clearly that economic growth and expansion does not occur without giving rise to government costs and problems. The programme outlined for the forthcoming year involves undertakings in several new fields designed to strengthen Ontario's productive power and well being. We are deeply conscious of the benefits which come from our democratic heritage and of the need for maintaining, within the limits of our financial power, the full employment of our workers.

Gratitude is expressed to the civil servants of Ontario for their industry and faithful discharge of their duties and responsibilities. The reduced turnover in civil servants reflects improved conditions.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have secured a copy of His Honour's Speech, which I will read:

(Reading dispensed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

#### THE ENTRANCE OF HORSES AT EXHIBITIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 40, intituled, "An Act to Repeal the Entrance of Horses at Exhibitions Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Why the urgency?

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the Speech of the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that I have received, during the recess of the House, notification of a vacancy which has occurred in the membership of the House by reason of the death of James Shannon Dempsey, the member for the Electoral District of Renfrew South.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, your brief official announcement brings before us the fact that since the organizational session of the Twenty-fifth Legislature, held on September 8 last, the House has lost one of its members in the person of James Shannon Dempsey, the member for Renfrew South, since 1945.

Mr. Dempsey, at the time of the last general election, held last spring, be-

came the centre of some controversy—and I may say that he was not unused to controversy—but it has no part in what I am going to say this afternoon, beyond the fact that at the short session last September, Mr. Dempsey arose in his place opposite me, and stated that he desired to make a full and complete statement on this controversial matter when the House met at the next regular session.

At that time he stated—and I quote his exact words—:

I am satisfied that I can show this House that my position throughout has been legal, and entirely proper in every sense of the word, and that I will be completely vindicated before this House and before the Bar of public opinion.

Those were the last words spoken to this House by Mr. Dempsey, the late member for Renfrew South.

I deeply regret, as do his many friends, that the opportunity was not allowed to him to make that statement. His untimely death which intervened ruled out that possibility.

So I would like now to say something about James Dempsey, a man who most of us in this House knew. He came from a family long connected with the Ottawa Valley, and with northern Ontario.

His father before him rendered public service as the reeve and warden of his great county, and like so many from the Ottawa Valley, served in other capacities, and took part in the founding of modern northern Ontario, where he was an early citizen, and where, in his last days, he was a Crown Lands Agent at the new town, then, of Cochrane. The "Valley"—as many of us call it, because it is really our valley in Ontario—is indelibly connected with the north country, and such localities as Mattawa, Pembroke, Renfrew and Arnprior are part of that great section of Ontario.

Mr. James Dempsey was first elected in 1945, and afterwards chosen by his constituents as their representative in the 3 succeeding general elections.

He was a lumberman, and his beginnings were in those very romantic days of the white-pine men, days which, of course, have passed away. He grew up in the tradition of those white-pine men, who operated on our lakes and rivers, and notably in the Ottawa Valley.

He possessed all that independence, which he frequently exhibited here in this Chamber, and which we were led to expect, from one of that tradition, particularly from one who was of Irish descent.

He did not conform—as those of us who knew him are aware—too easily to discipline and convention. He never hesitated to express his own views independently and forcefully on subjects before this House.

He was a character in his own right, and that fact was always understood by his own people, those who knew him, but perhaps not understood by others who did not know him.

He was a man of great heart, and sympathies, particularly for those in difficulty. He fought with great force and forthrightness, particularly for the people of little interest, whose problems always loomed large in his eyes.

I think that is the assessment those who knew him would make of James Shannon Dempsey.

He had a host of friends in the province, particularly in his own riding, the southern hinterlands of which are one of Ontario's great development areas.

Many there will long remember "Jim" Dempsey, as he was known. His sudden passing has left very many whom he served well to mourn him, and at this time I extend to all of those friends and to his family, our deepest sympathy.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish that my words would blend with those of the hon. Prime Minister in extending to the family of Mr. Dempsey, our sincere appreciation for his legislative work, and for a life lived as he would have lived it.

The hon. Prime Minister is accurate when he says that Mr. Dempsey was not



one who easily conformed to certain ideas or ideals; he was indeed a rugged individualist, a man who had a pattern of his own, and who diligently sought to work out that pattern as he saw it unfold in this province and this country.

It is true that "Jim" Dempsey was a man of great humanitarian instincts, a man who liked to help the little fellows on the street; the men, who, in his opinion, need help very badly.

I remember quite well when we were on the Reform Institutions Committee, that "Jim" Dempsey gave money many times to people who came to him for help.

I do not know whether he knew that the money would not be returned. I think he perhaps guessed that much of it would not come back, but it is an indication of the humanitarian outlook which Mr. Dempsey had on life, and those of us in this House who live after him will be able, I think, to draw an inspiration from some aspects, at least, of the life of James Dempsey.

Therefore, I join with the hon. Prime Minister in extending our sympathy to his relatives at this time.

MR. D. MACDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, I was glancing through the early pages of the record of the last session of this Legislature a year ago, and I was struck with the fact that a year ago, when the Legislature met, many hon. members of the House, including yourself, rose and expressed warm congratulations to James Dempsey on the occasion of the anniversary of his birth.

It was a sober reminder of how uncertain and unpredictable are the fates which shape our destinies on this earth.

I did not know Mr. Dempsey personally, but I knew of him from his work in this House, and I knew of him as a resident of eastern Ontario, having been a resident of eastern Ontario for a number of years myself, and no matter what differences others had with James Dempsey, everyone agreed he was a kindly and open-hearted person; he was

a person who was a "straight shooter"—and I suspect that is the sort of word he would use. There was not a trace of hypocrisy in his make-up.

I think those characteristics in themselves are sufficient, and I would like to join in the regret we all feel at his untimely passing, and to express our sympathy to his family.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I express pleasure on behalf of yourself and the membership of the House, in the presence here today, after a very considerable interlude, of the hon. Justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

We have present today, gracing these proceedings, the Chief Justice of Ontario, the Chief Justice of the High Court, and a number of the Justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

This tradition really goes back to the very beginning of Ontario. At the first session of the Parliament of Upper Canada, held 163 years ago, in a very humble building on the banks of the Niagara River, present on that occasion was William Osgoode, the then Chief Justice of Upper Canada whose name is commemorated in many places in our province.

Today I am glad to have a renewal of that tradition which unfortunately lapsed, but which has now been revived, and to have the attendance here of the hon. Justices of the Supreme Court headed by the Chief Justice, and the Chief Justice of the High Court.

This is in keeping with the history of our province, and is a part of what His Honour referred to in his closing sentences today regarding the value which is placed on our great democratic traditions.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.55 of the clock, p.m.











# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Wednesday, February 1, 1956.

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Notice of vacancy, Rev. A. W. Downer .....   | 13 |
| Introducing Mr. James A. Maloney, Mr. Frost .....  | 13 |
| Reading and Receiving Petitions .....  | 13 |
| Motion for provision of printing reports, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 13 |
| Motion for appointment of Standing Committees, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                                      | 17 |
| Motion for appointment of Select Committee, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 17 |
| Motion to appoint Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for present session, Mr. Frost, agreed to ..... | 17 |
| County Courts Judges Criminal Courts Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading                             | 18 |
| Credit Unions Act, 1953, Bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading .....  | 19 |
| The Crown Witnesses Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....                                       | 19 |
| The Jurors Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 19 |
| Magistrates Jurisdiction Act, Bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....                                 | 19 |
| The Insurance Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....   | 19 |
| Department of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading .....                              | 20 |
| Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading .....                  | 20 |
| Separate Schools Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading .....   | 20 |
| Presenting of accounts, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 22 |
| Increase in school grants, Mr. Porter, Mr. Dunlop .....  | 22 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 24 |



# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Chief Election Officer, and laid upon the table a certificate of a by-election held since the last session of the House, returning Mr. James Anthony Maloney as member elect for the Electoral District of Renfrew South.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: "This is to certify that in view of a writ of election dated November 28, 1955, issued by the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario and addressed to Doctor John S. Findley, Returning Officer for the Electoral District of Renfrew South for the election of a member to represent the said Electoral District of Renfrew South in the Legislative Assembly of this province in the room of James S. Dempsey, Esq., who, since his election, as representative of the said Electoral District of Renfrew South, has departed this life, James Anthony Maloney, Esq. has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated January 25, 1956, which is now lodged of record in my office.

Signed 'Roderick G. Lewis'

Chief Election Officer.  
dated Toronto, February 1, 1956."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I ask your permission to escort into the Chamber and introduce to you the member elect

for the Electoral District of Renfrew South in company with the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch).

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Mr. James Anthony Maloney, member elect for the Electoral District of Renfrew South, who has taken the oath, has signed the roll, and now claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member take his seat.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that during the present session of the Legislative Assembly provision be made for the taking and printing of reports of debates and speeches and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him; also that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports in the amount of 800 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, to the Legislative Library, to each member of the Assembly, to the Reference Libraries of the province, to the Press Gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the Assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when this motion of the hon. Prime Minister is accepted by the House, it means that the printing and distribution of *Hansard* is on its way for another year, on precisely the same basis as that which existed last year.

In this House, *Hansard*, as all hon. members are aware, has had a rather checkered career. It started out in the first instance as a printed document which was quite acceptable. It then became, for 4 years, a mimeographed sheet, which became so bulky as to present a storage problem of some magnitude. Later on, it was restored to its former state of printing, which is the type we have today.

I want to seriously suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he should have included in his motion this afternoon, a recognition of this fact, that the present subscription rate for *Hansard* is one which prohibits its wide distribution in the Province of Ontario. It is a subscription rate which I suggest amounts almost to a suppression of information so far as the public is concerned. Federal *Hansard* goes out to the people throughout Canada for \$3.00 per year, yet the people of Ontario, if they wish to be informed as to what is said in this Legislature, are asked to pay \$7.50 a year for a session which lasts but a small proportion of the time that the Federal House sits.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we would be rendering a great service to the public at large if we allowed *Hansard* to go out to them at a reasonable figure. I do not know what argument can be advanced on the other side, save the one of cost. It may be that the hon. Prime Minister as custodial officer of the finances of the province, is alarmed at what it might cost if the subscription rate for *Hansard* was \$3.00 or \$4.00 instead of \$7.50 as it is now, but I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that it would be interesting for him to tell the House just how wide the distribution of *Hansard* has been until now at the \$7.50 rate. I venture the

suggestion that, in the Province of Ontario, there are not more than 100 subscribers to *Hansard* at \$7.50.

I may be out on that, and I would like to be informed, but I am quite sure in my own mind that the \$7.50 rate constitutes a barrier for those who want to be informed of the proceedings in this Legislature.

Even if the sending out of *Hansard* at a subscription rate of \$3.00, \$4.00 or even \$5.00, entailed a loss of money to the Province of Ontario, it seems to me it would be a good investment by making available to the public, information relating to the proceedings in this House. I seriously urge upon the hon. Prime Minister, even at this late date, to do something that will put *Hansard* within the reach of all those who want to read it in this province.

It may be that much of what is said in this House is not worth reading, but, after all, one of the ways to correct that is to allow people to read it and make their comments, and if they do that there is not very much doubt but that the quality and standard of debates will improve from the reaction we get from the public throughout the length and breadth of the province. We are putting a barrier between this Legislature and the people of the province by setting up a subscription rate on *Hansard* which is out of all proportion to what the people feel it should be, and what they pay for a comparable Federal service.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Prime Minister comments on the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would like to add my support to the general plea, and add one or two reasons — which I think are irrefutable — for making *Hansard* available to the people of this province on the widest possible basis, and which would involve a reduction in the price.

I was rather interested in reading the brief submitted to the Government a few weeks ago by the Farmers' Union, that *Hansard* should be at a price of not more than \$3.00, which is the price of *Hansard*

in the Federal House where sessions are 3 or 4 times as long.

Quite apart from that, it seems to me this portrays rather a strange contradiction on the part of a government: the hon. Prime Minister presents himself—and I do not doubt his sincerity—as a champion of the democratic processes, and a strengthening of the democratic traditions. Yesterday referred to a 163-year-old tradition which was revived after a lapse of some time, and we had the hon. justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario attend the opening of the Legislature.

It is one thing to speak about “strengthening these traditions,” and then act otherwise by placing a barrier in the way of the distribution of the reports of what goes on in this House. Surely this is not the most effective way of strengthening these traditions.

There are two other basic reasons I would like to present for the consideration of the hon. Prime Minister and the Government. This House reflects a situation in the Province of Ontario which is a matter of concern for everybody, irrespective of Party affiliation. The fact of the matter is that in the election we had in the Province of Ontario last June, the 84 members arrayed on the Government side received the support of 25 per cent. of the electorate in this province; the Opposition parties received the support of another 25 per cent. of the eligible electorate, and fully as many people who voted for us in this House—whether we be Government or Opposition—were so disinterested or perhaps disgusted, in the light of some of the things that went on the year before, that they did not bother to vote at all.

HON. MR. FROST: They did not vote for you, that is one thing certain.

MR. MacDONALD: Interest in provincial affairs has dropped to a point where fully one-half of the electorate do not bother to turn out at the polls. I suggest it is possible if they had an opportunity to find out what goes on in this House, at a price that is not prohibi-

tive, it would be a means of developing a greater interest in provincial affairs.

The second reason I draw to the hon. Prime Minister's attention is one to which I do not pretend to have a conclusive answer. I think if one were to analyze the situation, one would discover in certain areas of this province, the news coverage of what happens in the provincial Legislature is very, very sparse. For instance, if you go to the eastern end of Ontario—where I myself lived for some 12 or 15 years before coming to Toronto a year or so ago—the people who are active in the papers in the Ottawa area which go throughout eastern Ontario, are the very people who themselves would confess that because of their preoccupation with what goes on in Ottawa, a very sparse coverage of provincial affairs appears in these papers. So, you have a whole section of the province where information as to what goes on in this Legislature is limited. If you go to the other corner of the province, you have another situation which I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister in connection with *Hansard* and in connection with another means of distributing information, and that is northwestern Ontario. Here we have a problem which is part and parcel of the geography of Canada; the northwestern part of Ontario, which is closer to Winnipeg, and its contacts with Manitoba are a great deal more intimate and closer than they are with Toronto.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): You are wrong there.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. member will go a little west of where he lives, he will discover that is the case; the daily papers read from Atikokan and Dryden west, are, in 95 per cent. of the cases, daily newspapers which come out of Winnipeg.

Another very interesting feature is this—and I took this matter up with the C.B.C. this year when we were arranging the provincial affairs' broadcasts. Last year, and for some time back, provincial affairs' broadcasts were not



carried by the local radio stations in this area.

Because of representations made to the C.B.C., arrangements have been made so the station in Fort Frances this year is carrying it, but the station in Kenora has indicated it was unwilling or unable to carry it. So the people read daily newspapers which come out of Winnipeg; and are afforded no opportunity to hear even through the provincial affairs' broadcasts, what happens in the Legislature. Here is another area of the province where making available the distribution of *Hansard* on the widest possible scale is something which should be in the interests of the Government leading this province today.

It is one thing to be a champion of the democratic processes regarding a matter. But, in this matter, rather than champion the democratic processes, I suggest this Government has been acting more in the role of the "reluctant Dragon" grumbling and grudgingly conceding even the present distribution of *Hansard*, inadequate as it is.

I suggest these reasons in addition to those the hon. leader of the Opposition has presented as very cogent ones for reconsideration by the government.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, it makes me feel at home to have this question raised again in the House. This used to be the subject of debate when others sat opposite.

I sat in this House—as did the hon. leader of the Opposition—for many years when there was no *Hansard* and I cannot say when *Hansard* was introduced in this Assembly in 1943 or 1944, that I viewed it with any particular enthusiasm. At that time, I was the Treasurer, and I certainly was interested in the expenses of Government, but I am now perhaps looking at it from a different viewpoint.

When *Hansard* was introduced, it started off as a stenographic, mimeographed report which was alleged not to be expensive, but like other things which grow and grow, it became very expensive, and I myself introduced the motion back in 1949, which I thought

had some regard for the expenses which the taxpayers of this province had to pay from their pockets. However, despite a number of debates on this point, I might say that this particular point has never been raised before to my recollection or knowledge.

MR. MacDONALD: It was raised last year.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, if it was, I have not any recollection of it, but at that time I agreed on behalf of the Government that the reports should once more be printed. I think I made some rather caustic reference to the reporting at that time, and I think with some justification, too, as a result of full consideration the present arrangement was arrived at, providing for the printing of 800 copies of *Hansard* and distribution as is now set out in the motion.

I have listened to the reasons given in debate on this question, most of which are quite irrelevant. I might say to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) that I have always found the electorate of the Province of Ontario to be highly intelligent and discerning, to take a great interest in the affairs of this province, and to be interested in good government. They have demonstrated the truth of that by their votes.

I would refer the hon. members to the result in Renfrew South just this month, where I think considerably over 75 per cent. of the electors went to the polls and voted in great preponderance in favour of the Government candidate. I certainly would not say that the people in Renfrew South, because of their proximity to another province, were less interested in the affairs of this great province of which they form a part.

As I say, when I first dealt with this matter a number of years ago, I was the Provincial Treasurer, and since that time have retired from that position; a new Treasurer has been appointed, and now perhaps I may take a more generous view of some of these things than I did before. It is true that the Farmers' Union members came to see

my colleagues and myself some few days ago and I was very much interested in the plea they made for a reduced cost of *Hansard*.

They mentioned the fact that our *Hansard* costs twice as much as that of Ottawa, and I think you will readily acknowledge that probably the contents are twice as good, perhaps more so. In any event, I was interested that they would want to obtain a wider distribution of *Hansard*. I wish to advise the hon. members that, after listening to this fine deputation a few days ago, I requested the hon. Provincial Treasurer to refer it to the proper committee, and to cut the cost of *Hansard* in two, so it would be available to others at the lowered cost.

Therefore, I repeat to the hon. members opposite that what they say is really not relevant to this motion, because what they have brought up has already taken place.

MR. OLIVER: You are sure you did not make the decision just now?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Standing Committees of this House, for the present session, be appointed for the following purposes: (1) On Privileges and Elections; (2) on Education; (3) on Private Bills; (4) on Standing Orders; (5) on Public Accounts; (6) on Printing; (7) on Municipal Law; (8) on Legal Bills; (9) on Agriculture; (10) on Game and Fish; (11) on Labour; (12) on Mining; (13) on Government Commissions; (14) on Lands and Forests; (15) on Travel and Publicity; (16) on Health; (17) on Conservation.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that a Select Committee of 11 members be appointed

to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows: Messrs. Collings, Cowling, Gordon, Kerr, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Murdoch, Noden, Pryde, Robson and Sandercock.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 4 members.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, with reference to this motion, if any hon. members are interested in being on any particular committees, if they will so advise it can be arranged.

If it appears that some hon. member has been omitted from a committee, and he would like to serve on it, that can afterwards be remedied, but perhaps it would save time if that were done now.

I am anxious, Mr. Speaker, that the committee should meet as soon as possible to strike the members of the committees so we can proceed with the committee work which I think will be quite heavy this session.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. James Frederick Edwards, the member for the riding of Perth since 1945, be appointed Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Edwards in the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Mr. Prime Minister and hon. members of this House; I am pleased to accept this position, and I do want to thank the hon. Prime Minister very much for this appointment, and its concurrence by the House.

Your co-operation will make my work much easier, and I accept this position

as an honour to the riding I have had the honour to represent since 1945.

I will put forward my best efforts on your behalf, toward the successful conduct of the business of this House.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, it is a very great pleasure to welcome you to this position, and I am glad to have had the honour and privilege of presenting the motion, and I know the hon. members of the House will be very glad to support it.

You have been a member of the Legislature now for many years, going back to 1945, and have been a good representative of your riding and a capable member of this House, and we are very glad today to see you occupying this position.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word to what the hon. Prime Minister has said. You, Mr. Chairman, might not have been my choice if I could have arranged easily to have someone else, but the fates did not so decree, and you are there, and now that you are there, I am sure we will bow to your rulings, although I noticed you did not even say you would be "fair and impartial," and I may say I have never heard a member take this Chair without making that observation. I will take it, however, it does not mean anything of a serious character, and knowing you as coming from Perth County, I imagine it was felt it would be taken for granted that you would be fair and impartial.

The appointment of the hon. member for Perth does hold out hope still for those who have not in any way been noticed by the hon. Prime Minister. The rewards for faithful political service come slowly, but surely, as we have witnessed today, and I ask the hon. members opposite not to be without hope, because the day may still come when you will be rewarded.

It so happens that the reward today involves one whom I believe will discharge his responsibilities, and the duties which will be entrusted to him, well and faithfully, even though he did not say "in a fair and impartial manner."

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that I took it as read, when I asked for the co-operation of all the members to facilitate the successful carrying out of the business of this House.

MR. OLIVER: Well, we will try to get along together.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I assume you are going to be fair and impartial, and I have nothing more to add than to congratulate you upon your position, and to look forward to working with you.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the committee rise and report very great progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of Bills to introduce on behalf of the hon. Attorney-General, if the House consents that they be introduced without notice. These Bills are, for the most part, non-contentious, at least I assume they are. If they are contentious, we will soon hear about it.

Therefore, if the House consents, I will proceed with the introduction of these Bills.

## COUNTY COURT JUDGES CRIMINAL COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter, in the absence of Mr. Roberts, moves first reading of Bill No. 41, intituled, "An Act to amend the County Court Judges Criminal Courts Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.



He said: This Bill provides that the Clerk of the Peace for the county or district shall be the Clerk of the County Court Judges Criminal Court, a practice which has been carried on for some time.

### CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter, in the absence of Mr. Roberts, moves first reading of Bill No. 42, intituled, "An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains certain amendments designed to assist credit unions in their operations, and to bring the Act into line with the existing practice.

The Bill has been developed by the Superintendent of Insurance, in collaboration with the Credit Union League, which represents substantially all the credit unions in the province.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that all these Bills will be referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

### THE CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 43, intituled, "An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. OLIVER: What are you going to do with the Crown Witnesses Act, Mr. Attorney-General?

HON. A. KELSO ROBERTS (Attorney-General): This Bill merely provides for increasing the fee from \$3.00 to \$4.00 per day for witnesses, and brings it into line with fees allowed in summary conviction cases, under the new Criminal Code.

### THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 44, intituled, "An Act to amend The Jurors Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister please give an explanation, briefly?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill changes somewhat the procedure for drawing the panels of jurors. At the present time, two Justices of the Peace, together with the Crown Attorney, the Sheriff, and the Deputy Sheriff attend. The Justices of the Peace receive, I think, \$1.00 for the attendance, and it has been found very difficult to get Justices of the Peace to attend, particularly at that fee, and it has been felt quite unnecessary, insofar as you have the Sheriff, the Deputy Sheriff, and the Crown Attorney, to have Justices of the Peace attend, as the panels are chosen simply by the selection from lists drawn by lot out of a machine, and it would appear there is ample protection when the names are drawn.

### MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 45, intituled, "An Act to Repeal the Magistrates Jurisdiction Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 46, intituled, "An Act to Amend the Insurance Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the explanation given by the hon. Attorney-General in regard to the Magistrates Jurisdiction Act. I wonder if he would advise us what the purpose of that Act is.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this Act is regarded as an obsolete Act, and should be repealed. It is really to get rid of a certain amount of red tape in wording the appointments of magistrates.

Under the Act giving jurisdiction to the magistrates, the actual authority is contained in the Acts themselves, and by repealing this Act, it will be much more simple to make the necessary appointments.

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves first reading of Bill No. 47, intituled, "An Act to amend the Department of Education Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that all of these amendments will be referred to the Committee on Education on second reading.

This one authorizes the making of agreements between Ontario and Canada respecting Federal-Provincial bursaries and scholarships.

## SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves first reading of Bill No. 48, intituled, "An Act to amend the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the objects of this amendment are:—section 1 of the Bill is to permit a county council to include in the high school district, a village in which there are two continuation schools, and to allow the county council to decide whether the property assessed against one of the continuation schools so established by the school board shall continue to be so assessed, and excluded from taxation for high school purposes.

The second section defines "Rate-payers."

## SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves first reading of Bill No. 49, intituled, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will give a brief explanation of this Bill. It is to permit supporters of separate schools who may live in an adjoining section, and not in the section in which the school is located, to vote at meetings held in that school by the ratepayers.

In the second section, the time for holding meetings is changed from 7 o'clock to 8 o'clock, to provide a little more time.

The third section provides that teachers in separate schools may have the same powers regarding suspension of pupils and other disciplinary matters, as are now given to the public school teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to say that after today, it will be necessary for any member who wishes to speak before the Orders of the day, to put his request in writing to Mr. Speaker. This information is for the benefit of the new hon. members of the House; the older hon. members know about it, because it has been the custom for a long period.

We have in the House this afternoon, two very distinguished citizens of this province, who have made a great contribution to our province.

They were the discoverers of Geco and the Wilroy mines, and are Mr. William Dividowich and Mr. Roy Barker.

We welcome these distinguished citizens of our province to the House this afternoon.

MR. OLIVER: Before we leave this matter, Mr. Speaker, there is one point I would like to make. It is in regard to this question of informing Mr. Speaker in writing, as you suggest, before a question is put to the Ministry. I think the fact may be contrary to what was said, and I do not want to mention it if it is not correct, but I think this has grown up very recently. I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree that is

rather a cumbersome system under which the Opposition members will have to operate.

We may want to ask the Ministry a question on public policy. The system has been that we put our requests in writing at some specified time ahead of the opening of the sitting, and say to Your Honour what we intend to ask of the Government Minister.

The practice has been for the Speaker of the House to get in touch with the Minister of the Crown concerned, and say to him, "Now, Mr. Oliver wants to ask you certain questions in relation to your department. Will you answer Mr. Oliver, if the question is asked, or would you rather not answer it?"

I presume that the rule goes so far as to suggest that if the hon. Minister is reluctant to answer, then he has protection. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this whole matter could be simplified in the interests of the proceedings of the Legislature itself. What is wrong with going back to the old idea of an hon. member standing up in this House, before the Orders of the day, and asking an hon. Minister of the Crown directly across the House, a question relating to his department? If the hon. Minister of the Crown is not conversant with the factors involved in the answer, then he can certainly say, "I will give an answer to my hon. friend tomorrow," or at some future time. Nine times out of 10 the hon. Minister will be able to give the information on the spot.

It seems to me that would expedite the business of this House. We would make it more informative, and it would certainly make it easier for the Government to be questioned on public policy. I would like to hear the hon. Prime Minister on that. It seems to me it is a very important point.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have never objected to the hon. members opposite, or anyone else, asking me questions in the House directly. Very often such questions arise in the ordinary course of proceedings. I think the origin of this rule can be traced to the fact that at one time in this House it became the

practice that statements were made and questions asked before the Orders of the day, which became more and more lengthy. As a matter of fact, they interfered with the business of the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition will recollect this happening some years ago.

MR. OLIVER: We have gone from one extreme to the other.

HON. MR. FROST: That may be. I recollect the time when discussion before the Orders of the day took most of the afternoon, after which the hon. members of the House were so exhausted, that the House was adjourned. The hon. leader of the Opposition will remember those days. In fact that was true during the time that he sat on the Government benches, and he may remember some of the dramatic occasions of those days.

I think it is fair when there is a question to be asked that the hon. Minister should know of it and be present in order to give an answer. Sometimes it is impossible to give an answer without reference to the departmental officials. The hon. leader of the Opposition should realize this. I know he would never be unfair. Sometimes if a question is asked, and the hon. Minister is unable to answer on a matter which may involve some technical detail, when it is recorded in the Press, it may appear that there has been an evasion or something of that sort.

I think it is fair there should be some notice. The reason for giving the notice to Mr. Speaker, in my recollection, was that Mr. Speaker would know what question was to be asked, and decide whether it was fair to all Parties. I think that was the purpose of it.

I was interested in looking at the procedure in England some two or three years ago. There, questions are submitted in writing and printed on the Order paper. Then the ministry takes the questions which will be answered on a certain day, and Mr. Speaker is the one who arbitrates on the matter, and decides how long the question period will be. They always had a very interesting question period at the times I



attended their proceedings. I think there is perhaps something in their system which is preferable to ours.

Personally, I have no objections to questions, and I would be prepared to discuss the matter with the hon. leader of the Opposition to see if there is any way of dealing with it in the Rules. I suppose there are rules covering this point which were adopted at the time of the revision of the Rules of the House some years ago. We can discuss the Rules and see if there is some way which would provide for more latitude in that regard.

Again, I have no objection to making the asking and answering of questions freer. Perhaps it would be a very good thing. I believe our Rules are elastic enough to permit that. I am not familiar with the wording of the Rules, although I know the background of how the Rule came to be drawn, and I think there were very good reasons for it at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: There will be no restriction. This Rule is simply for the orderly carrying on of the business of the House.

We have in the House this afternoon four important visitors from Indonesia. Indonesia is a new country, formerly the Dutch East Indies. It has a democratic form of government, with a House of Commons only. These four gentlemen are from the Ministry of Religious Affairs and are in Ontario to study our system here. We welcome these distinguished visitors to our province and to our Legislature.

Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House as follows:

(1) Public Account for the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

(2) Report of the Provincial Auditor of Ontario, 1954-1955.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to make

an announcement which no doubt will be of considerable interest to the school boards throughout the province.

Following a supplementary estimate passed by this House during the session of 1955, a special grant of \$4.00 per pupil was paid to elementary and secondary school boards throughout the province. The amount of that grant was approximately \$4 million, or slightly more. It has been considered advisable to inform the school boards this year as to what they may expect in the way of a special grant of a similar nature. Most school boards are preparing their budgets for the current calendar year, and it should be of great assistance to them, and in the interests of general economy, to be informed now as to what they will receive.

Provision will be made for a special grant, in addition to the grants under the general legislative grant regulations, of \$6.00 per pupil in the elementary and secondary schools. The grant to be based upon the daily average attendance in 1955. This represents a 50 per cent. increase over the special grant paid last year, and will represent a sum in excess of \$6 million.

It has always been difficult to devise a system of school grants which applies with equity to the great variety of financial requirements of school boards in different areas of the province. The general legislative grant regulations as revised about 4 years ago, went far to provide a satisfactory basis. One of the elements in determining the amount of a grant, is of necessity the local assessment in the area concerned. Naturally variations in standards of assessment lead to obvious inequities. Although the per pupil grant also entails certain possible inequities in other directions, they may offset to some extent some of the inequities arising from the general system of grants. The whole problem of school financing and provincial contributions thereto are constantly under review by the Department of Education, the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Treasury Department.

The advance being made toward the equalization of assessment throughout the province is an essential move towards establishing a sound foundation upon which provincial contributions to the schools can be equitably worked out.

There are now 934 municipalities in the province. Of these 634 presently apply the standards outlined in the Provincial Manual of Assessment issued by the Department of Municipal Affairs, and thus there is substantial progress toward equalization of assessment in a very large number of municipalities in the province. Indeed in the area now included in Metropolitan Toronto, which represents a population of about one quarter of that of the province, a standard assessment has been applied. The Provincial Manual of Assessment is intended as a guide, and its application is not mandatory. In view of the fact that assessment becomes a necessary factor in calculating provincial grants to schools, it is highly important that a standard assessment be adopted as soon as possible throughout the whole province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education will also make a statement with reference to the general grants made.

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, may I say that the announcement just made by the Provincial Treasurer will bring relief, satisfaction, and, I might say, jubilation to school trustees and taxpayers throughout the province. This is more than they have been expecting, as I very well know, because they have been hoping for a repetition of the supplementary grant of \$4.00 per pupil which was made last year. Now they are getting 50 per cent. more than they had hoped for. I must warn them that this supplementary grant of \$6.00 per pupil is not an addition to last year's supplementary grant of \$4.00 per pupil, but is a replacement for it. This being the case, may I announce that, apart from this supplementary grant, the same generous grants will be paid this year

to school boards as were paid last year and I am optimistic enough to expect that the total of our legislative grants to school boards, for construction and maintenance, will be larger than last year. Last year's total was \$68.5 million.

May I also tell this House that I called a meeting last month, January 20, of the heads of the seven Ontario Universities and discussed with them a number of proposals designed to take care of the increasing enrolments which have already begun to be definitely noticeable. It was a most satisfactory conference and I found that the University authorities realize fully the magnitude and the urgency of the situation which will probably reach its peak in 1965 and will then continue at that level. It is not a tide of increasing enrolment but it will be a plateau. The University authorities readily undertook to consider carefully the several proposals which I made to them and we have agreed to have another conference in the very near future. In the meantime, we are proceeding with the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology.

MR. MacDONALD: With these increasing grants, would the hon. Minister indicate what percentage of the over-all cost of education, the provincial grants now represent.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I do not know how we can figure that out.

HON. MR. FROST: It goes up to 95 per cent.

MR. MacDONALD: Eleven or 12 per cent. in Toronto.

HON. MR. PORTER: It would be more than 95 per cent. in some places, when these extra grants are given.

MR. MacDONALD: It will be 30 or 35 per cent. across the province; in other words, 20 per cent. below the promise of 12 years ago.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House may I point out to the hon. members that

these first days, are of course days of organization, it takes time to build up the Order Paper and consolidate what is necessary to get the machinery of the Legislature in motion. Tomorrow the hon. member for Renfrew South and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie will move and second the traditional motion of reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Friday will necessarily be a day on which we will be very much restricted in regard to business, I think only in

regard to dealing with the matter of the reports of the striking committee set up today. However, I am hopeful at the beginning of the week the committees can begin to function and start dealing with the important matters which we have to consider in this House.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.15 of the clock, p.m.









ONTARIO

# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, February 2, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, February 2, 1956.

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Reading and receiving petitions .....                                     | 27 |
| Motion of Thanks for Speech from the Throne, Mr. Maloney, Mr. Lyons ..... | 29 |
| Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Oliver, agreed to .....                     | 45 |
| Presenting Reports, Mr. Dunbar .....                                      | 46 |
| Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                             | 46 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of the City of Chatham for special legislation to vest in fee simple, free of trusts, the lands known as Victoria Park.

Of the Corporation of the City of Sarnia praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Commission of The Sarnia General Hospital to borrow up to \$200,000 for current operating purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Leaside praying that an Act may pass repealing The Town of Leaside Act, 1939.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Etobicoke praying that an Act may pass enabling the corporation to enter into agreements for the acquisition of sewers and for related purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of North York praying that an Act may pass authorizing the council to pass by-laws requiring the maintenance of adequate and suitable heat of rented or leased dwellings.

Of The Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America praying that an Act may pass conferring upon the board

the same powers and rights as were conferred by its Act of incorporation—Statutes of Canada, 1939, chapter 62.

Of the Corporation of the City of Woodstock praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for the construction, maintenance, etc., of railway sidings, and to issue debentures therefor.

Of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass effecting certain changes in the constitution of the Public Utilities Commission of the city.

Of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass validating the sale of certain industrial sites.

Of the Corporation of Canadian Pacific Railway Company praying that an Act may pass vesting all property, etc., of certain subsidiary companies in the said corporation.

Of The Board of Education for the City of Chatham and The Chatham Suburban District High School Board praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement between the corporations providing for the accommodation of secondary school students of the Chatham suburban district, and related purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Timmins praying that an Act may pass authorizing a municipal bus transportation system.

Of the Corporation of the City of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement between the corporation and the corporation of

adjacent municipalities providing for funds to be raised by debenture issues for the erection of the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Of the Corporation of the Ottawa Community Chests praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands, etc., of the corporation from taxation.

Of the Corporation of United Cooperatives of Ontario praying that an Act may pass increasing the authorized capital of the corporation.

Of the Corporation of the City of Stratford praying that an Act may pass authorizing the corporation to grant \$30,000 to the Stratford Festival Foundation from the sinking fund surplus and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement between the corporation and The Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority respecting assessment, taxation and other matters relating to the "Peace Bridge."

Of The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing a pension plan, etc., for non-teaching employees.

Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass amending The City of Ottawa Act, 1952, and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Stamford praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement for the erection of a swimming pool and ancillary buildings on lands granted for park purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass authorizing pensions for employees and their families.

Of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston of The Presbyterian Church in Canada praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands comprising Glen Mhor Camp from taxation.

Of the Corporation of The Society of Interior Decorators of Ontario praying that an Act may pass continuing the corporation under the name "The Society of Interior Designers of On-

tario" and restricting the use of the designation "Registered Interior Designers."

Of the Corporation of the Canadian National Exhibition Association praying that an Act may pass to include the chairman of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto as an ex-officio member of the association.

Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto praying that an Act may pass authorizing an increase in the corporation's annual grant to the Toronto Convention and Tourists Association.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Nelson praying that Act may pass authorizing the election of school trustees for school area No. 1 of the said township by wards.

Praying that an Act may pass to incorporate Parkland Improvement Foundation.

Of the Corporation of The Protestant Home of St. Catharines praying that an Act may pass dissolving the said Home and vesting its assets in the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines to be applied to the erection of a Home for the Aged.

Of the Corporation of the Village of Richmond Hill praying that an Act may pass dissolving an injunction restraining the corporation from discharging effluent into a branch of the Don River and for related purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Chelmsford praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for the purpose of constructing a public school.

Of the Corporation of the City of Welland praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of debentures for the purpose of constructing a new municipal building.

Of the Corporation of the City of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing the installation of back-water valves in private drain connections at the request and expense of the owners of improved properties; and for other purposes.



Of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing the corporation to make grants to institutions, associations, etc., and for other purposes.

Praying that an Act may pass to incorporate The Metropolitan Toronto Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, for some years past, the House has met on Friday afternoons at 2 o'clock, instead of 3 o'clock, it being a more convenient hour to enable hon. members to get away for the week-end. This has worked out very satisfactorily, and with the view of extending the application of that provision this year, I would move that commencing tomorrow, Friday, February 3, and thereafter on each Friday of the present session of the Assembly, this House shall meet at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule No. 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

#### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

First order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

MR. J. A. MALONEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Lyons (Sault Ste. Marie) that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Louis Orville Breithaupt, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us. I would be less than human if I did not feel signally honoured at the very pleasant and cordial reception that has been given to me as the representative of the great constituency of Renfrew South from which I come.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the first words I should express to this honourable House are the words which would express, inadequate though they may be, my sincere thanks and appreciation for the very courteous welcome that has been extended to me by the hon. members of this House, no matter to which Party they might belong.

I am sure it is gratifying to all of us here assembled to recall that our nation and our own province were honoured in the year just passed by a visit on the part of Her Royal Highness, the Princess Royal. In the brief time that Her Royal Highness was graciously pleased to spend as our guest many of our people had the pleasure of meeting this distinguished member of the Royal Family. Her presence reminded us of the eventful reign of her distinguished father, the late King George V, and also of her beloved brother, our late King George VI, whose sudden passing from this mortal sphere still leaves with us a deep and abiding sense of loss.

The good wishes of all the members of this hon. House go at this time to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II and to her distinguished husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, as they visit their loyal subjects in Nigeria, a British Colony for almost a century. I must confess that it was enlightening to me to learn that this colony is larger in area than any country in Europe excepting Russia, and that it comprises a population of 32 million people. We join in wishing Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh a happy and fruitful visit with their loyal subjects in this great African

component of the Commonwealth, and we trust they may have a safe return to home and family.

It was with great regret that we in Renfrew South learned of the sudden and untimely passing of my predecessor the late James Shannon Dempsey. He represented our constituency since 1945, and as a result of his assiduous work on our behalf, in bringing our needs to the attention of the government of the day, Renfrew South is no longer a neglected constituency, but has been receiving, and will I hope continue to receive from this administration, those things of which we stand in need, and should have. The late Jim Dempsey was a close personal friend—a man of stout heart and great courage, the friend of everyone, and he will long be remembered for his life's work.

I am sure that the hon. members look with both approval and regret on the recent decision of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to relinquish the post of Treasurer of Ontario wherein he has rendered such distinguished service. It is something of a record to have brought down 12 successive balanced budgets. It is a record to have successfully financed the enormous accomplishments of the past few years, all of which will stand as enduring monuments to this administration. It is satisfying to be able to declare that never before has Ontario's credit stood so high in the money markets of the world. And it is also a matter of deep satisfaction that in these days of heavy government expenditure, Ontario has been able to maintain a moderate tax structure.

All of us, I am sure, are glad that the Prime Minister has lightened his personal responsibilities by relinquishing the portfolio wherein he has rendered such sterling service. And of course we regret that he will no longer give to the province that intimate attention to financial detail which has done so much toward winning our present unexcelled financial condition.

It is, however, a matter for congratulation that as Treasurer of Ontario the hon. Prime Minister, was able to choose a suitable successor from the

ranks of his tried and trusted colleagues. I congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) on his selection as head of one of the most important departments of government. As a private member, as Minister of Planning and Development, as Minister of Education and finally as Attorney-General for Ontario, the present Treasurer brings a wealth of experience seldom enjoyed by our public men. He takes on the added duties related to the newly constituted Department of Economics, which is already demonstrating its usefulness as an important branch of government. Our felicitations and good wishes are extended to the Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Economics. We are sure that he will add lustre to an already distinguished reputation.

May I also extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart) on his well-earned promotion to Cabinet rank. My hon. friend has long been recognized as a faithful and hard-working member of this House. I doubt that any member has given more freely of his time, energy and ability on numerous and important committees where so much of the ground-work of this Assembly is accomplished. As Minister of Travel and Publicity he will spearhead the work of the government in relation to our vastly important tourist industry and in publicizing the resources of our province.

My good and very close personal friend, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) returns to familiar territory. It is good to see him in his place with health restored and with no abatement of his physical and mental vigour. He endures like those great pine trees which still feature the Ottawa Valley. He is, in truth, Mr. Eastern Ontario, and I know there is no member of this hon. House who does not join with me in wishing him long life, good health, success and happiness.

Eastern Ontario is happy to see one of its representatives occupying the post of Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle). I do not need to say that many functions of this par-

ticular department are of very great importance, municipal planning, the establishment and operation of conservation authorities, the securing of new industry, and finally matters related to civil defence.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Goodfellow) won a distinguished and indeed enviable reputation as Minister of Public Welfare. In this latter department he accomplished a tremendous job resulting in the evolution of a sound and humane system of assisting those in need of some form of state aid. His years of experience in handling the affairs of an important department are backed up by a sound municipal experience which will help him in handling the onerous duties of his new post.

The hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) is, like the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) and the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle), a representative of an eastern constituency. The hon. minister visited our constituency during the recent by-election and I would like to thank him for his attendance there and to advise this House that his presence in our constituency contributed in no small measure to the very successful result that we obtained in the western part of South Renfrew. He has compiled a solid record of accomplishment in the Department of Travel and Publicity, and his extended experience will assist him in his new and important post. His extensive experience in law and as a member of the administration is backed up by his warm, kindly and very human character—most important qualifications in his new post in a department so very largely engaged in the worthy task of helping those unable to help themselves.

The Vice-chairmanship of Ontario Hydro, a post held for so long and with great distinction by another colleague of mine from the east, has now been transferred to the hon. member from Hamilton Centre (Mr. Warrender). The hon. gentleman enjoyed experience as a private member of this Assembly and also as Minister of Planning and Development. His experience in these fields

and his intimate knowledge of the workings of Hydro which have made his home community one of the great industrial centres of the Empire—these backed up by his wide experience in municipal politics—guarantee his success in this latest field of public service.

I should also like to congratulate my colleague from St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) on his elevation to Cabinet rank. The post of Attorney-General is an important one, and I know of no one better qualified than my hon. friend to direct its many and important activities. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have known the hon. Attorney-General for many years and it is I believe the unanimous opinion of the members of the legal profession and of the people of the province generally that the appointment which he has received and the honour which is now his, is one that is richly deserved, and his appointment is most popular. He is known as one of the most understanding of men, very human and most approachable. His attack on the problem of law enforcement on the streets and highways is a most commendable effort and one which already is getting tangible results. I am sure we all wish him well in his new sphere of service.

I feel greatly honoured in having been given the privilege of moving the Adoption of the Speech from the Throne. I do not mean to give the impression that this honour was conferred upon me personally, but rather that it has been conferred upon the people whom I have the honour to represent in this Legislature, the people of South Renfrew, a truly wonderful people in every sense of the word, fair, broadminded, tolerant, and understanding.

It gave me great pleasure to welcome the leader of the Opposition to our constituency recently and I know that I will have the opportunity of extending a welcome to him in the same capacity on some future occasion.

The by-election in South Renfrew is now history. The people of that riding went to the polls on January 12, last. They went in record numbers—80.4 per cent. of those eligible to vote did so.



What does such a large turnout mean? I am humble enough to realize, recognizing as I do my own limitations—that this remarkable response to our appeal was not so much because I am who I am, but it was another emphatic expression of the confidence of the electors in the government which I have the honour to support. It is an answer which is clear cut and decisive and which constitutes an overwhelming endorsement of the policies of this administration.

South Renfrew is a very large constituency in area as can readily be seen by a glance at the map of the province. We have a mixed population of wonderful, honest and God fearing people who are truly the salt of the earth. We have in our county people of English, Irish, Scotch, French, Polish, German, and Dutch descent, all of whom have made a remarkable contribution in the development of our county, and our country. We also have in our county a band of the descendants from the original settlers—the Indians. These Indians are located on the Indian Reservation at Golden Lake, in the Township of South Algona and are among my constituents. They have recently been given the right to vote and I am happy to report that they have, like the people all over the County of South Renfrew, given a very large majority in endorsement of the Frost administration.

Shortly before his death, the late Robert H. Saunders, who at the time was chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, saw to it that hydro facilities were extended into this Reservation and arrangements had been made upon the occasion of one of his visits to the Reservation that he was to return last year, at which time a demonstration was planned in his honour. He was to become a Chief of the Algonquin Tribe. Unfortunately his untimely death intervened and prevented this plan being carried out, but his memory is cherished and will be long remembered by the people of Golden Lake.

When one reviews the record of South Renfrew and its progress par-

ticularly since 1945—its progress and development are phenomenal, and I say that without exaggeration in any way . . . because the evidence of its phenomenal progress is there for anyone to see.

One of the main problems in a county such as ours is the condition of our roads. Prior to 1943 ours was a forgotten county when it came to the question of road grants. But we have moved a long way since then, Mr. Speaker. To illustrate: on our provincial highways in 1943 the province expended approximately \$250,000 in the constituency which I now represent—this expenditure amounted for the year 1952 to almost \$1 million, and in 1955 the estimated expenditure is approximately \$1 million. Our county has been signally honoured in having the first highway designated in recent years as a Queen's Highway in this province. And I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first road taken over by the province since 1943 and designated as a Queen's Highway—for many years a matter of contention, the road from Dacre to Renfrew, known historically as the "Opeongo Line" has been taken over by the province and is now designated as "Queen's Highway No. 132." The official opening of this highway will take place in the not too distant future. The hon. Prime Minister has assured us that he himself will be present on this notable occasion—and on behalf of my people I extend to every hon. member in this House an invitation to attend. It will be a memorable event and we will be delighted to welcome you to our great county.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that "Where there is no vision the people perish," and it takes vision, real vision, as related to Ontario's requirements as to highways, roads and streets. It would be impossible for me to attempt a detailed exposition of what this mammoth department of government—The Department of Highways—has done and is doing but I think I might mention just a few of the highlights as they appeal to me.

It seems to me that there are two outstanding and obvious needs in the

matter of highways which have been left to this government to meet and they are indeed facing up to them. One of them is the need of a modern dual-lane highway of the highest standard extending across Ontario from Windsor to the Quebec border. What we have known as old highway No. 2 and especially that part of it from Newcastle to the Quebec border is hopelessly obsolete and undoubtedly inadequate. It is now gradually being relegated to the past and soon we shall have what this province requires: a modern, high standard, dual-lane highway.

The second need is a trans-Ontario highway through the northern part of this province, and this is already well on its way in the form of the Trans-Canada Highway.

The Trans-Canada Highway, Mr. Speaker, runs through South Renfrew for a distance of approximately 30 miles, and it is expected that once the Federal Government really decides to get behind this project, our Highway No. 17 will be improved very substantially.

In the matter of development roads, this government has been very helpful by virtue of the policy adopted in 1946, when the province first undertook the construction of numerous development roads, which have been built in order to assist those municipalities whose financial resources do not permit them to undertake the large expenditure required in the construction of such roads. It is confidently expected that more development roads will be constructed in our county and that they will be brought up to proper standards to accommodate present-day traffic requirements.

The gravel road is rapidly disappearing, Mr. Speaker. The amount of money expended in maintaining such roads is a severe strain on the municipal councils, and they must disappear. It is my hope that the Department of Highways will continue its programme of black top paving of these roads, so that the enormous cost of maintenance will be removed. As a matter of actual

fact I am advised by the Good Roads Committee of our county council that the Department of Highways has already approved a 3-year programme of county roads development involving the expenditure of about \$1,500,000. During the year 1955 about \$350,000 has been spent on this programme, and about 30 miles of black top paving has been completed in North and South Renfrew.

It should be noted that in the days when my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition was a minister of the Crown, these grants for roads were paid only to counties and townships. Under the policy of this government, these grants are also made to cities, towns, and incorporated villages with the result that our towns and villages are taking on a new look in the matter of their streets—something that would have been impossible under the old system because of the already heavy burden of municipal taxes.

I know we shall await with interest any amendments to the Highway Traffic Act which will work toward the cause of traffic safety. I have no doubt the vexed question of speed limits will be the subject of due consideration. I suggest that the variable speed limit as applicable within municipal boundaries was a forward step, and might well be the subject of more consideration than it has received at the hands of most of our municipal councils. Possibly some serious consideration should be given to raising the speed limit on dual-lane highways. Possibly a higher speed limit during daylight hours, and a lower speed limit during hours of darkness would be worthy of the consideration of this House. Also, I venture to suggest that it should not be difficult to devise some legislation to correct the all too prevalent practice of a certain type of driver who persists in "hogging the road" mile after mile in the passing lane. It should also be possible to eliminate one of the great hazards of the day. I refer to the driver who pokes along the busy highway at 20 to 30 miles an hour fully aware of the fact that behind him there is a line-up



of traffic anxious to be on its way. These drivers to my mind, Mr. Speaker, are most inconsiderate, and they contribute more to the high incidence of traffic accidents than any other single factor. Basically, our legislation dealing with highway traffic is well conceived and sound. But there is always room for improvement.

I should also like to commend the administration on the establishment of the Ontario Highway Transport Board. This will relieve the Ontario Municipal Board of a heavy volume of work which certainly was overtaxing the board's facilities. I am sure that the chairman of the newly constituted board, Mr. Sam Hughes, Q.C., will give a very good account of himself in his new office. He comes from a most distinguished family with a high tradition of public service, and I am sure we wish him well in his new and responsible duties.

It would not be in order for the baby member of this Legislature to speculate as to the findings and recommendations of the Select Committee on Toll Roads. Enough has been adduced by way of testimony to indicate that the subject is one with many strong proponents, and again there are areas of very strenuous opposition. The committee has undertaken a heavy and responsible task, and I have no doubt their report will receive the most serious consideration of the House, and that the findings and recommendations will be of the very greatest value.

Another very important matter in any constituency in Ontario is that of adequate provision for the education of our children, the citizens of tomorrow. It was with great pleasure I heard the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the hon. Minister of Education advise yesterday that it was proposed to increase the grant per pupil from \$4.00 per annum to \$6.00 per annum. This is a matter which I know will meet with universal approval by all the school boards in Ontario. It is my considered opinion that every dollar spent on education reaps a large return, and the record of this government in providing funds by

way of grants in order to provide proper educational facilities for all our children is such that, irrespective of Party affiliation, we as citizens can be justly proud. In our county, in the last days of the former administration, we received in grants for our elementary and secondary schools what appeals to me to be the niggardly sum of less than \$90,000. In 1954, in South Renfrew, we received for elementary and secondary schools in our towns, villages, and municipalities the sum of \$595,000; and in 1955, at least \$650,000. It can be readily seen that this government has looked forward with vision in the field of education, and has made provision for the future needs of our people so that equal opportunity will be provided for all of the citizens of tomorrow. With our rapid increase in population in the past 10 years, and with the tremendous increase predicted for the years that lie ahead, we have a great responsibility imposed upon us to see to it that we are ever mindful of the growing necessity for maintaining the high standard of education presently provided, and even improving that standard to meet the requirements of the future.

The provincial government is giving marked attention to technical institutes. These institutes give specialized training to those students who for one reason or another do not feel able to go on to university but who require special training in some trade not available in our secondary schools, and it is my hope that such an institute will be made available in the very immediate future for the people of eastern Ontario, so that it will no longer be necessary for our students to come to Toronto or elsewhere to attend these technical institutes. And I would assure the Department of Education that we in Renfrew South have all the facilities required for the establishment of such an institute which would service students throughout eastern Ontario. Our people are looking forward to the establishment of a technical institute in Renfrew County, and I am sure that every co-operation will be given to the department if it decides to choose our county



as a site for this very worthwhile undertaking.

It is unnecessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to tell the members of this House that we in Renfrew County have tremendous water power resources from the Ottawa and Madawaska Rivers. Enormous hydro developments have been undertaken at Rapides des Joachims; and at Chenaux on the Ottawa River; at Barrett's Chute and Stewartville on the Madawaska River; and the Otto Holden station at Le Cave near Mattawa. From these 5 projects, 3 of them located in Renfrew South and one in Renfrew North, we have a capacity of well over 1 million horsepower. When one looks back to the days when we were told that we had too much hydro-electric power in this province; to the time when Hydro contracts were being cancelled with reckless abandon, we should be truly thankful that we had men of vision, men of courage, who with characteristic foresight went ahead and boldly charted the course that would provide for the tremendous demand that would be made for hydro-electric facilities; and the end is not yet in sight.

Today we are in the midst of a huge power development on the St. Lawrence River, from which we in Ontario will receive a further 1.1 million horsepower. But even this is not enough. And in order to provide for the inevitable expansion that will take place, this government, with the Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd., and our Hydro-Electric Power Commission are presently collaborating with the Federal authority in the construction of a pilot plant at the Des Joachims development, which plant when finished will, it is hoped, provide further electrical power from nuclear energy. There would appear to be no doubt of the success of this project, and we can look forward to the future in the full knowledge that we will always have adequate power resources which are so necessary for the further development of this great province.

I am sure that every hon. member of the Legislature was delighted to learn

in the Speech from the Throne that legislation will be introduced to enable this province to advance \$35 million in capital to a Crown corporation as our share in the construction of an all-Canadian gas pipe line which will undoubtedly contribute greatly to the industrial development of this nation, and this province.

Speaking of hydro in our own constituency I would like to point out that in 1944 we only had from the hydro area at Cobden, 88 miles of rural hydro lines with 611 rural customers.

In 1946 we had 136 miles of rural hydro lines and 944 rural customers.

In 1947 we had 150 miles of rural hydro lines and 1,165 rural customers.

As of December 31, 1955, we have 950 miles of rural hydro lines and 6,674 rural customers.

From the hydro area serviced from Arnprior we had in 1944, 60.5 miles of rural hydro lines and 514 rural customers.

In 1946 we had 105 miles of rural hydro lines and 579 rural customers.

As of December 31, 1955, we have 580 miles of rural hydro lines and 3,240 rural customers.

This, Mr. Speaker, has been a phenomenal increase and it is my earnest hope that before another Parliament is elected in Ontario our hydro facilities will be extended to every part of our constituency. It might well be that the commission will be required to relax its regulations in order to make this possible, but in view of the fact, as the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests will testify, that a very large percentage of the land in our county still remains vested in the Crown, thereby making it impossible to strictly comply with the stipulation of 3 customers to the mile, I feel certain that the commission will be reasonable in this matter and will treat each particular application on its merits and in consideration of the circumstances that exist in that particular area.

In Renfrew South we have had a very substantial and rapid industrial development during the past few years.

The Town of Arnprior has progressed with great rapidity. Several new industries have located there and I would mention particularly the Playtex firm, which has contributed so much to the development of the Town of Arnprior. This is really one of our most stable industries. I had the opportunity of going through this modern plant recently with the general manager, Mr. O'Neill, who was most kind and courteous and who pointed out the different processes required in the manufacturing of such articles as baby pants, brassieres, girdles and such products as that. The Pfizer people are presently erecting a plant in Arnprior in which I understand many pharmaceutical products and modern drugs will be manufactured and from which these will be distributed to the trade throughout Canada.

In the Town of Renfrew we have unfortunately lost our two textile plants and this necessarily caused a serious condition of unemployment among men and women who had devoted their lives to the textile industry. Fortunately, however, we have other industries in the town and surrounding country which employ many of our people—such as Dominion Magnesium, Light Alloys, Renfrew Electric, Stewart Hartshorn, Renfrew Aircraft and Engineering, and recently the R.C.A. Victor people decided to locate in Renfrew. A large plant is under construction and almost nearing completion. In the meantime this company has been operating from temporary quarters in the manufacture of television chassis and parts, automobile radios, and other products. It is expected that they will be moving into their new plant in the very near future and this industry will certainly help tremendously in the development of our community.

We hope to attract still more industry to our county. The Eastern Ontario Development Association has been doing a remarkable job in this connection. Our Chambers of Commerce located in Arnprior, Renfrew, Eganville and soon in Barry's Bay are working in close collaboration with the Industrial Commission, in their respective communities

and with the Eastern Ontario Development Association, and the Department of Planning and Development, making known to the world what a wonderful place eastern Ontario is.

I might add that we in Renfrew County are unanimously of the opinion that ours is the choice section of eastern Ontario and of the Ottawa Valley. We have everything to offer—honest, thrifty, hardworking people—cheap power and plenty of it being developed right in the county—excellent railway facilities being supplied by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways. We have good roads and will have more and better roads. We have wonderful churches to take care of the spiritual welfare of our people. We have excellent schools and fully qualified teachers. We have tremendous natural resources. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have everything to attract and nothing to detract. I say to industry—come to Renfrew County—see for yourselves and I will venture to predict that you will see the many advantages in locating where there is so much to offer.

A few years ago the Algoma Steel people of Sault Ste. Marie decided to investigate the possibility of the iron ore deposits in the Calabogie area of the Township of Bagot in our county. A subsidiary company known as Algoma Ore Properties Ltd. has taken over large tracts of land in the area. I am reliably informed that these iron ore deposits are vast in extent. It is expected that intensive development will be taking place in the very immediate future. This is going to result in a wonderful expansion in our county. And one does not require too much imagination to envisage the picture of the future.

I can see now a new road being constructed from Highway No. 17 at or near Glasgow running along the Mada-waska River to Burnstown, on to Calabogie in the Township of Bagot to Black Donald in the Township of Brougham through Griffith and Mata-watchan and across the height of land toward the uranium mines of Faraday



and Bicroft, in the Bancroft area, thus opening up an absolutely new territory for further exploration and expansion and affording a rapid means of highway transportation from the Ottawa Valley to the larger cities and factories of central Ontario and return. Only today, Mr. Speaker, I learned of a new uranium discovery that has been made in the Calabogie area. This information, if correct, would lead me to believe that in addition to these iron ore deposits in the Calabogie and Bagot area, we are going to have another vast expansion necessitated by this uranium discovery.

And now, Mr. Speaker, what of the future so far as this great province is concerned. It is a recognized fact borne out by statistics that as of now Ontario is contributing in large measure, and oftentimes more than her share to the full development of this nation. Ours is the leading manufacturing province, and we are responsible for more than 50 per cent. of Canada's total manufacturing output. We the people of Ontario contribute more than 50 per cent. of the taxes paid in to the Federal treasury each year. It is well that these matters be borne in mind not only by us, but by all Canadians. The Federal Government should, and I am sure does, realize the tremendous contribution being made by Ontario to the national economy. The Federal Government must see to it that adequate revenues are assured to the governments of all provinces and this should be done without infringing in any way upon our own provincial autonomy.

It was a wonderful experience we had in this Chamber a week ago today when the hon. Prime Minister made the opening address in the presentation of Ontario's submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. Those of us who were fortunate enough to hear him were proud indeed of his able presentation of our position (past, present, and future), in the Canadian economy. We have lived in tried and troublous times in this country and in this province in the days that are gone. We have survived and gone on to

greater achievements. And so it is that we look forward to the challenging days of the future, secure in the knowledge that we have in our hon. Prime Minister, a man who is courageous, and forthright; a man who can contemplate the future with confidence and provide for its needs by the wonderful qualities of leadership and administrative ability that he possesses. It is not often given to man, to enjoy the overwhelming confidence of the people in the full and ever increasing and continuing degree that the people have shown in our leader, the Prime Minister of Ontario. It may be that some of our friends in the Opposition do not share this view. But if they have any criticism to make of our leader or of the government of which he is the Prime Minister, might I respectfully suggest that they profit from the lessons of the past. Let it be criticism of a constructive nature and not that type of criticism that is designed to tear down and destroy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I thank you and through you the members of this House for their very kind and courteous attention, and may I venture to express the hope that we, the members of this Legislative Assembly, no matter what our political affiliation might be, in the full realization of the serious responsibilities that are now ours, will work together for our people, for the betterment of our constituencies, and our province and our nation. My hope is, that I, in some small way, will be able to contribute to the future development of this great land, to make it the place we want it to be and that it is destined to be. In closing may I say "Forward, ever forward Ontario."

MR. C. H. LYONS (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker: Last year when I rose to address this august Chamber I found it fitting that I should make mention of the changes undergone by the "ginger group." Of the original 9 members, two had been elevated to Cabinet rank, one had become the government representative on the Ontario Racing Commission, one had answered the siren call of matrimony, and one has departed this life. Little did I realize at



that time that we were to be so soon deprived of the very anchor man of our whole organization.

I can assure you that whenever any of us in the ginger group were uncertain about a course that we should follow, we invariably found the solution by consulting with the hon. member from Dufferin-Simcoe. Now, he too has been wrenched from our midst. Yet it is with a feeling of great pride that we see him gracing the sacred chair of Mr. Speaker, where we will no longer require to consult with him in our uncertainties. He will tell us unsolicited, what, and what-not, to do.

I wish to congratulate the hon. members of this Legislature on their choice of the hon. member from Dufferin-Simcoe as Speaker of this House. As a result of the re-arrangements of this House, I find myself at a slight disadvantage. From the vantage point of my higher seat, I was able in previous sessions to look down into the front rows of the Opposition members and discern their forked tails. Now I must satisfy myself by looking at their smiling, cherubic countenances.

Also, I said at the last session that despite the decimation that its ranks had undergone I felt certain that the "ginger group," re-inforced as it was by new blood, would be able to keep this left flank nailed down until the hon. Prime Minister pinned the tail on the donkey.

And pin it on he did on June 9 last. He also did a good job of pinning back the ears of Opposition Parties. Old Man Ontario has enjoyed too many of the advantages of this government's excellent type of administration to easily succumb to the lulling strains of the Opposition's song of "Will you come into my parlour said the spider to the fly."

The moral of the past election is this: The people of Ontario voted for themselves. The people can discern right, and will make their way to a knowledge of right; the whole human mind, and therefore with it the mind of the nation, has a continuous, ever-improving knowledge and existence; the appeal from

unjust government will be made quietly, earnestly, perseveringly, to the more enlightened collective reasoning of tomorrow; submission to just government is due to the popular will, in the confidence that the people, when in error, will amend their doings. That is the immutable law, and silent is the force which controls it, until election day.

In voting for the Frost administration last June the people demonstrated that they appreciate good government and good men. The people know good men. They want good men. They want great men, but great men are none too plentiful. They want these great men not only in government, but in the field, in the market-place, in the counting-room, and at home; wherever they touch the deepest life of this country or the life of coming generations. They want men, not noisy and loud-mouthed, but men who are felt as electricity is felt, that lives, but makes no abominable noise and racket.

In every age, these good men, by their faithfulness, have kept alive the core of good, and by their heroism they have captured a larger good. And when nowhere within the lives of all civilizations such men could be found, see how they have started up in barren deserts and primeval forests, as did the United Empire Loyalists; in their flight they picked up the scattered seeds of liberty, and standing on a bleak rock let the winds winnow them over a great Dominion.

The people of Ontario demand as their leader a man of intelligence, a man of integrity, a man of well-known and approved political opinions. They demand a statesman; they demand a reformer, after, as well as before, an election. They demand a politician in the highest, broadest, and best sense—A man of superb moral courage. They demand a man acquainted with public affairs—with the wants of the people—with not only the requirements of the hour, but with the demands of the future. They demand a man broad enough to comprehend the relations of this government to the other provinces

and spheres of power within the Dominion. They demand a man well versed in the powers, duties, and prerogatives of each and every department of this government. They demand a man who will sacredly preserve the financial honour of this great province—one who knows enough to know that the provincial debt must be paid through the prosperity of its people; one who knows enough to know that all the financial theories in the world cannot redeem a single dollar; one who knows enough to know that all the money must be made, not by law, but by labour; one who knows enough to know that the people of Ontario have the industry to make the money, and the honour to pay it over, just as fast as they do make it.

The people of Ontario demand a man who knows that prosperity comes hand in hand through the golden harvest fields; hand in hand with the chugging motors and splintering rock of the great Pre-Cambrian shield; hand in hand past the open furnace doors; hand in hand by the flaming forges; hand in hand by the grinding pulp, and whizzing paper machines; hand in hand by the chimneys filled with eager fire—greeted and grasped by the countless sons of toil.

Our province, crowned with the vast and marvelous achievements of the past, asks for a man worthy of the past and prophetic of the future; asks for a man who has the audacity of genius; asks for a man whose political reputation is spotless as a star. The man who has in full, heaped, and rounded measure, all these splendid qualifications is the present plumed and gallant hon. Prime Minister of this province, the hon. Leslie M. Frost.

Standing here in the early part of 1956 it is impossible that one should not look back, and equally impossible that one should not look forward. We are just at the close of 40 years of great achievements. We pride ourselves upon the work the people of this country have accomplished. We point to a government based upon the consent of the governed, to wealth which has been

piled up such as few countries have ever attained within 40 years. It is such a condition of life, such as has seldom existed in other countries. The year 1955 has been a wonderful, wonderful year. Who can remember one to match it?

Looking over the pages of accomplishment for 1955 I could think of no other adjectives with which to describe this year of Grace. Almost every page tells of new achievements, new records, new plannings.

Look at the story of Canada's mining industry. Trace that story back for 40 years. That's quite a period in the history of a young country; one in which many changes and a lot of growth would naturally be expected. But we can't find any one who will say that 40 years ago he was looking forward to a year like 1955.

The story of 1955 would have read like a fairy tale to the reader of 1915. Who in that bygone year would have visualized a day when mine production would be reachably close to \$2 billion a year; a day when Canada would be one of the world's major mineral countries, with all the security, diversity, and prosperity that such a position carries with it?

This, I think, underlines the basic differences between the Canada of 1915 and of 1955.

Forty years ago Canada was a hopeful, but still young and struggling and somewhat timid, Dominion. Today she is a world power, self-reliant, prosperous, strongly set. The difference is reflected in the bearing of her people. We see it in the attitude of her mining men, in the boldness of their planning, the assurance and skill with which that planning is executed. There are no thoughts of stopping, no doubts about the future, no hesitation in their strides toward greater goals.

Seeing all these signs of bigness, and remembering the achievements of the past, it is now easy to be visionary about the future. Mining people talk with confidence of the days when mineral output will be \$10 billion, or even \$20 billion annually.

Official figures published by Ontario and Federal authorities, disclose, for example, that from 1945 up to and including 1955, the total value of metals produced in Ontario rose from \$188.3 million to \$578 million, an increase of approximately \$400 million or more than 200 per cent. More than 57,000 mining claims were staked and recorded in 1955 in Ontario, thus beating the all-time high of 1954 by 7,300 claims. Talk of the magnitude of the north! Those 57,000 mining claims cover more than 3,500 square miles of territory—more than the total area of the Counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin and Middlesex combined, or for further comparison it embraces an area greater than the combined areas of the Counties of York, Peel, Halton, Ontario, Dufferin and Wentworth. I suggest to you that if we do not get the proper co-operation from the people of southern Ontario, one of these days we will get a staking crew together and come down here and stake a couple of counties. I am particularly interested in staking York South. I do not know what the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) would say if he went to the office one morning and found that some of those four-lane highways he was building were running through a lot of mining claims of that fellow Lyons from Sault Ste. Marie. That, Sir, is the magnitude of the claim-staking business for one year in this great province.

Thirty years ago the hon. Charles McCrea, one of Ontario's Minister of Mines with an abounding faith in the future of the industry, was wont to refer to the bounteous gifts of Old Mother Nature with which this province has been blessed. Perhaps even he, however, would be surprised at the developments which have taken place since then.

Talk of the whirling wheels and clattering hammers of industry! Then look to Blind River. The most reliable estimates available at this date show that \$1 billion worth of uranium ore has already been outlined in the rocks of the area, and another \$2 billion is indicated.

What this entirely new source of wealth is likely to mean to the nation's

economy is staggering. Already the Federal Government, through the Eldorado Mining and Refining Corporation, has signed contracts for the purchase of nearly \$500 million worth of ore from the Pronto Mine, the two Algom Mines at Quirke Lake and at Nordic Lake, and from Consolidated Denison. This represents more than \$1.7 million in new wealth for Ontario every week.

That sort of revenue does not come from wishful thinking. Great capital investment has been required to bring Pronto and the other mines into production. Already more than \$100 million in capital has been committed for this district. Of this, the Algom Mines call for the expenditure of \$42.5 million, Consolidated Denison of \$37.5 million, Pronto of \$7.5 million, and the Noranda Acid Plant of \$3.5 million.

All this represents only private investment. We must also consider the public funds which are being invested. Ontario Hydro has invested something like \$1 million in the district. The government shares in the outlay for the new model town which will arise at Elliot Lake, and the road to serve the town and the mines will be constructed as a government investment.

This new highway will replace the mining access road built last year jointly by the Ontario Department of Mines and the mining companies. The present road has served a useful purpose in speeding early production, but it is admittedly inadequate for the traffic it is now called upon to bear.

Pre-engineering on the new 26-mile-long highway has been completed and tenders have already been called for the first part of the construction work. The job is to be divided into 3 separate parts, each 8 or 9 miles long, and the remaining two tenders are to be called soon. It is to be a gravel-surfaced road built in every respect to the specifications required by the Department of Highways. I understand that one of the terms of the contracts is to be that work start immediately, so that the whole project can be completed by mid-summer this year. The contractors are to be instructed that



certain sections be done first so that the highway can be used by the heaviest equipment in conjunction with the existing road.

The Elliot Lake Improvement District was set up formally on September 1, 1955. The work of clearing the first section and designing the townsite has been completed and construction work is proceeding rapidly. Already I understand, Algoma has spent \$700,000 on the project.

The new town itself will be an important addition to Canada's municipal life. Eventually, and before too long, its population may well reach the 20,000 mark, enough to place it in the smaller city class. The Ontario Department of Planning and Development, which is, of course, acting in a supervisory capacity, is determined that a high rate of housing facilities and other amenities will be maintained, and residents of the new municipality will have every right to feel pride in their homes.

Talk of the rhythm of the motor, of the hammer, of the drill! Look to the Manitouwadge district where Geco and Willroy Mines are both sending their mining shafts into the bowels of the earth. Geco with approximately 15 million tons of ore in sight should commence milling in April, 1957. Willroy with an estimated 2.5 million tons should follow Geco and be in production somewhat later in 1957. Access roads were built into this camp by the Department of Mines in 1954 and this year both the C.P.R. and C.N.R. Railways built branch lines. Thus another townsite that will eventually number 5,000 souls is being ushered into the great family of mining townsites in northern Ontario.

Talk of a story of progress more exciting than any other spot on the globe today! Look to the Caland Mine in Rainy River. Here no less than 100 million tons of high grade iron ore has been outlined, but in order to reach this fabulous wealth an entire lake must be removed, huge dams must be erected, tunnels sent splintering through the rock, and the staggering accumulation of 160 million cubic yards of silt must

be sucked away. Already Caland is one of Hydro's largest users of power and the mine will eventually scoop 3 million tons of ore out of the earth's crust each year.

Think, Mr. Speaker, of the vision required to incubate such schemes; think of the raw courage and native ability required to project those visions into reality. Think! And you think of northern Ontario.

Try to visualize the huge iron ore project at Algoma Steel Corporation's Helen Mine, and you will see the shadow of financial giants striding across the rough landscape in seven-league boots. Here at the confluence of the mighty Michipicoten River and Lake Superior there has unfolded one of the greatest sagas in the history of Canadian pioneering development.

At present the Helen Mine of Algoma Steel Corporation disgorge 7,000 tons of iron ore each day. This ore is carried on a gigantic overhead tramway consisting of huge cables to which are attached, at a few yards interval, buckets capable of holding upwards of one ton of ore. The tramway travels a distance of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles, following the undulating contour of the ground over hill and down ravine, and over hill again, to discharge the ore in pockets at the sintering plant. There, some impurities are driven from the raw ore and the residue is ready for market.

The estimated indicated ore at the Helen Mine is between 500 million and 1 billion tons, and the ore body has not yet been delimited. Seven thousand tons of rock per day is a large tonnage, yet the Helen Mine at present indicated tonnages can produce 7,000 tons every day for the next 500 years.

In order to realize the life expectancy of the Helen Mine—500 years—remember that it is only 300 years since Etienne Brule, the first white explorer ever to set eyes on Lake Superior, dipped his paddle into its clear waters. Figures of such an astronomical nature stagger the imagination.

I can never think about the wonders of northern Ontario without thinking

of those brave souls who pioneered its towering hills and frothing rivers. They chose their home sites in some wilderness glade, or in the thick forest, or where the land most sparkles with flowers. There they marked the extent of their possessions by driving stakes into the earth or by blazing trees. Like the wild bee which sets them their example of industry, they constructed their homey cabins with logs and boughs, and taught the virgin soil to yield a pittance for their daily sustenance.

They seemed to say, these pioneers of our rugged land, "Crowd fearlessly to the forests; plant your homes in confidence for the country watches over you; your children grow around you as hostages, and the wilderness, at your bidding, surrenders its grandeur of useful luxuriance to the beauty and loveliness of culture."

Their ears seemed to hear the footsteps of the coming millions that gladdened our Atlantic shores; and their eyes seemed to discern in the dim distance the whitening sails that were to enliven the Pacific with the energetic sounds of our commerce.

Many of these worthy pioneers came to our shores from foreign lands, yet we had no more patriotic men under the flag than they proved to be, the thousands of them who fought to preserve this country. And I think just as much of them as I would if they had been born on Canadian soil. What matters where a man was born? It is what is inside of him that counts—what kind of a heart he has, and what kind of a head. I do not care where he was born; I simply ask, is he a man? Is he willing to give to others what he claims for himself? That is the supreme test.

When I look around me today, and think of the advance of my northland, of the work that was done by those valiant pioneers, I think of the thousands who crossed the mysterious sea, of the thousands of ships with their brave prows pointed toward the west. I think of the little settlements on the shores of our countless lakes, on the

banks of our springing rivers, on the edges of our boundless forests.

I think of the winters of want, of the days of toil, of the nights of fear, of the hunger and hope.

Think of the courage, the sufferings, and hardships.

Think of the home-sickness, the disease, and death.

Think of the labour; of the millions of trees that were felled, while the aisles of the great forests were filled with the echoes of the axe; of the thousands of miles of furrows turned by the plow; of the thousands of miles of fences built; of the countless logs changed to lumber by the singing saw, of the thousands of huts, cabins and houses.

I think of the work. Listen! And you will hear the hum of wheels. The wheels with which our mothers spun the flax and wool. Listen! And you will hear the looms and flying shuttles with which they wove the cloth.

Think of the thousands still pressing toward the north, of the roads they made, of the bridges they built; of the homes, where the sunlight fell, where the bees hummed, and the children laughed; of the little villages with mill and shop, church and schoolhouse; of the husky dogs, of the crack of the driver's whip as they mushed through the whitening snow.

I can see the endless procession of bateaux and canoes. See the glimmering campfires at night. See the thousands up with the sun and away, leaving the perfume of coffee on the morning air. Listen and you will hear that faraway cry of "silver," "gold," "copper," "iron," "nickel," and you will see thousands edging along forest trails, climbing the mountains, and pressing on into the northland.

Think of the toil, the courage it took to possess that great land!

Think of the ore that is being dug now; the furnaces that light the nights with flame; the factories and mills by the rushing streams.

Think of the inventions, the improvements that changed the hut to the cabin, the cabin to the house, the house to the palace, the earthen floors and bare walls, to carpets and pictures; that changed famine to feast, that changed toil to happy labour, that changed poverty to wealth.

Think of the cost.

Think of the separation of families; of boys and girls leaving home taking with them the blessings and kisses of fathers and mothers. Think of the home-sickness, of the tears shed by the mothers left—by the daughters gone. Think of the thousands of brave men, deformed by labour, now sleeping in their honoured graves.

Think of all that has been wrought, endured, and accomplished for our good, and let us remember with gratitude, with love and tears, the brave men, the patient, loving women who pioneered and subdued this great hinterland for us.

Those pioneers are dead now. They died in the land that they created with their bare hands. They sleep in the land that they cherished. They sleep under the flag that beckoned them to this great Dominion, under the solemn pines, the sad hemlock, the tearful willows, and the embracing vines. They sleep beneath the shadow of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine and storm, each in his windowless palace of rest. But they made a great land of what they found. It had taken millions of years to create that land. Its soil was being made by the great rivers and lakes, and being brought down from the mountains for countless ages. It was standing like a vast pan of milk, with the cream rising for millions of years, and they were the pioneers that got there when the skimming began.

Yet they took no pains to vaunt their deeds: And when their work was done they knew not that they had finished one of the most lasting conquests ever performed among men. They left no record as to whose agency was conspicuous, whose eloquence swayed, whose generous will predominated, they were satisfied that their work was whole. They

are willing to stand like the mightiest trees in the northland, vigorous, and colossal, sending their summits to the skies, and growing on their native soil in wild and inimitable magnificence, careless of beholders.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall quite vividly, I am sure, the beautiful verses written by Dr. John McCrae during the First World War titled "In Flanders Fields." One verse of that memorable poem goes like this:

To you from failing hands we throw  
the torch,  
Be yours to hold it high.  
If ye break faith with us who die  
We shall not sleep  
Tho' poppies grow in Flanders fields.

That sentiment, Sir, is equally pregnant when applied to the vigorous pioneers who bore up with unflinching hope in those hard days, and covered the land with their labours.

If ye break faith with us who die . . .

Looking back now from a few years past the mid-century mark of the 20th century what is our reply to those valiant souls?

Have we broken faith with them?

Why, Mr. Speaker, the very anvils of the land beat out the answer like the throbbing of a mighty drum.

They beat out the answer with statistics showing that this banner province is today blessed with  $5\frac{1}{4}$  million citizens and at the present rate of growth it will be 6 million by the year of Our Lord 1960. From 1943 to 1955 we added  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million people. Not only have we drawn to this province more than half the immigrants coming to Canada, but our own birth rate and natural increases have risen to the highest levels ever attained. This alone testifies most eloquently to the faith we have kept with our pioneer forefathers.

The anvils of the land beat out the message of confidence engendered by the sound policies formulated by the government which I am proud to support. Policies that have encouraged the investment of \$15 billion between the



years 1943 and 1955 to expand and modernize our industrial structure, to add to our power, transportation and communication assets, to develop our natural resources and to enlarge our physical stocks, houses, highways, hospitals, schools and university facilities. Since 1943 the capacity of such Ontario industries as primary iron and steel, automobiles, pulp and paper, farm implements, and nearly all appliances has been doubled and in many cases far more than doubled. The capacity of the Ontario hydro electric generating system, one of the best yardsticks of our economic growth and of the rise in our living standards, has increased three-fold. Despite the fact that employees in manufacturing now work 5 hours less every week than they did a dozen years ago. The average weekly wage or salary in Ontario has climbed 113 per cent. Consumer expenditure in the province has risen by over 176 per cent., far outranging the increase in prices. Not only are Ontario people eating more meat, poultry, eggs, fresh fruits and vegetables, but it is a rare home that does not have some durable conveniences and labour-saving appliances. Herein is the measured march of our progress—translated into rising living standards, widely distributed across the province and among all income groups.

All this has been breath-taking, for in the formulation of government policy an attempt has been made to achieve an atmosphere favourable to economic expansion, and to the steady advance of better living—not for the privilege of any special segment of the people—but for all.

The anvils of the land sing out the story of this province's co-operation in the establishment of old age pensions and old age assistance payments for persons 65 years and over. Read this, the story of how this province pioneered a plan of disabled persons' allowances, raised mothers' allowances and increased the amount of assistance for children's aid, of how it stimulated the construction and establishment of homes for the aged by paying capital construction and maintenance grants; of how it

encouraged the building of new hospitals, and the expansion and modernization of existing hospitals, of how it increased medical and nursing personnel.

The mighty anvils of this great province beat out the story of the millions spent on education. The millions provided the municipalities to help keep down the municipal tax rate; the vast sum spent on conservation and the millions spent on highways.

The anvils beat out a merry, merry tune for the people of northern Ontario and especially for the riding of Sault Ste. Marie. The highway which the entire world has been holding its breath to hear about—the famous Lake Superior Highway—is under actual construction, and by late autumn will have broken through much of the wild rock barrier which has hitherto been such a formidable obstacle to its construction; the burning desire that has smouldered in the hearts of men for a third of a century has finally taken materialistic form.

Today it is a noble land that we possess; a land that can feed a great portion of the world; a land whose coastlines would enclose half of the countries of Europe; a land set like a sentinel between the two great ideological concepts of the day. We are a mighty people; a people sprung from the most masterful blood of history; a people perpetually revitalized by the virile, man producing, working folk, of all the earth; a people imperial by virtue of their power, by right of their institutions, by authority of their great hearted purposes. We possess a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of statesmen who are flinging the boundaries of this Dominion out into unexplored lands and savage wildernesses; a history of a multiplying people who over-ran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets who saw the consequence of evil inherited from the past, and of martyrs who died to save us from them; a history remarkably logical, in the process of whose tremendous reasoning we find ourselves today.

And now Mr. Speaker, I wish the members of this august Assembly to know that I am proud of the signal honour accorded the constituency of Sault Ste. Marie, when I was awarded the honour of seconding the motion for adoption of the Speech from the Throne.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Renfrew South on his eloquent and masterful presentation in moving adoption of the Speech from the Throne. Having heard him speak it is simple for me to understand why the happy electors of his constituency chose him as their standard bearer for the by-election held last January 12. He undoubtedly appealed to them as one of the few men capable of filling the most prodigious pair of vacant shoes ever to stride within the hallowed walls of this beneficent old structure.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the hon. member from Renfrew South's motion to adopt the Speech so graciously and adequately delivered to this Legislature two days ago by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: We have been making good progress but we have moved just a little too fast this afternoon. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Child) had submitted a question to be asked previous to the Orders of the day, and we moved too fast for him to ask that question.

He is asking permission of the House to revert back to "Orders of the day."

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, before you do that, unless it be thought we take all that the two hon. members have said today as conclusive evidence, I think perhaps in a day or so I might be able to say a word or two that may be considered somewhat opposite to the views which have been expressed. In order to provide that opportunity, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, with the permission of the House, we will revert back to Order No. 7, "Orders of the day."

MR. A. J. CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, now that we have reverted back to Orders of the day, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney-General, concerning a newspaper article in today's paper.

It is a Hamilton publication, and the headlines scream in large black type, "Sex Charges Fail Against Local Man."

A man recently released from Kingston Penitentiary after serving 5 years for sexual offences was yesterday released from police custody in Hamilton when 16 criminal charges involving young children were either dismissed or abandoned in magistrate's court.

Accused was 41-year-old Douglas Cline, of Hughson St., who is now free again after Joseph Dubeck, representing him in multiple trials before Magistrate Arrell, successfully argued that no conviction could stand in law solely upon the uncorroborated and unsworn evidence of a single child.

A total of 16 charges, combining indecent assault and contributing to juvenile delinquency were laid by police following two months' intensive investigation by Detectives Kingerley and Carrington, and testimony by child victims of molestation which varied, in details described, from the improper handling to physical injury suggesting an attempt at sodomy.

One after another 3 little boys—10, 12 and 9—took the stand and testified to being approached by the accused man and taken by him to back yards in the early evening, this in the downtown area. There various offences took place; the children were quite simple and understandable in describing what happened to them. They were quite definite in their identification of the accused. In one case, a mother told of examining her

child's body and taking him to the family doctor, who wanted a specialist to see him.

These children did not testify under oath. In the case of small children, any judge or magistrate who feels their understanding of an oath may be limited, may accept unsworn testimony.

The question to the hon. Attorney-General has 3 parts:

1. Will your department make an investigation of this case regarding the decision of the magistrate?

2. Could the Crown have laid any other charges, apart from those that were laid, that would have resulted in a conviction on the evidence heard?

3. Is this another case of the Criminal Code protecting known sex deviates or perverts, contrary to the best interests of the public?

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): In reply to the question just presented by the hon. member for Wentworth, my department, immediately on learning of the disposition yesterday in Hamilton Magistrate's Court of certain charges against one Douglas Cline, made inquiries and it appears that the reason for the dismissal of the charges mentioned in the member's question was lack of corroboration.

In criminal cases where children of tender age are presented as witnesses, it is the duty of the magistrate to satisfy himself as to whether or not such children understand the nature and implication of an oath. If he decides in the affirmative, then, of course, evidence given by one child and corroborated by another (both sworn) could be sufficient for a conviction.

If the magistrate decides that the children do not appreciate the value of the oath, as he apparently did in these case, he then must further satisfy himself that such child appreciates that he or she should tell the truth before admitting the unsworn evidence.

In this case the unsworn evidence was taken; therefore it is assumed that the magistrate accepted the probability that the children would be telling the truth. However, as there was no other sworn evidence to corroborate their statement or other corroborative evidence, under the existing rules of evidence established by the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act, he felt obliged to dismiss the charges, he having in his discretion decided that these children could not be relied upon sufficiently to give their evidence under oath.

I have been informed that this morning Cline was taken into custody and an application was made to a local magistrate in Hamilton to issue an order remanding him to a mental hospital for examination, he having been charged with indecent assault in still another case. The magistrate was not prepared to make a committal order at this time but the hearing of the charge of indecent assault is proceeding.

My department has given instructions to the Crown today to take proceedings under part 21 of the Criminal Code to have Cline declared a criminal sexual psychopath. This, of course, will involve another hearing and until these matters now before the Courts are disposed of, further comment by me would be inappropriate.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House, the following:

1. Thirty-fifth annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Fund.

2. Twenty-ninth report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario for the 12-month fiscal period ending March 31, 1955.

3. Ninth report of the Liquor License Board of Ontario for the 12-month fiscal period ending March 31, 1955.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 4.50 of the clock, p.m.









# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Friday, February 3, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Friday, February 3, 1956

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Report of Committees .....  | 49 |
| Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading | 53 |
| Municipal Arbitrations Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading .....    | 53 |
| Forest Fires Prevention Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....   | 53 |
| Presentation of Reports, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 53 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....                                    | 54 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1956

2 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following Petition was read and received:

Of the Corporation of the City of London praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement conveying the assets of The London and Port Stanley Railway Company to the City of London and for other purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch), I beg leave to present the report of the select committee appointed to prepare the list of members to compose the standing committees of the House, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Murdoch, from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read, as follows, and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the standing committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:

### COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs. Cass, Davies, Edwards, Grossman, Kerr, Murdoch, Nixon, Oliver, Patrick, Pryde, Robson, Stewart, Thomas (Oshawa)—13.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Messrs. Auld, Beckett, Boyer, Brandon, Cass, Chaput, Child, Connell, Cowling, Davies, Dymond, Edwards, Fishleigh, Graham, Hunt, Jackson, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnston (Carleton), Jolley, Lavergne, Letherby, MacDonald, Maloney, Monaghan, Morin, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Parry, Patrick, Price, Pryde, Rankin, Reaume, Robson, Root, Spooner, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Wintermeyer, Worton, Wren, Yaremko—45.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

### COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Beckett, Brandon, Child, Chaput, Collings, Connell, Cowling, Doucett, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Gordon, Graham, Grossman, Hall, Hanna, Innes, Jackson, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolley, Kennedy, Lyons, Lavergne, Macaulay, Mackenzie, Maloney, Morin, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Parry, Patrick,

Price, Pryde, Rankin, Reaume, Robarts, Root, Sandercock, Scott, Spooner, Stewart, Thomas (Oshawa), Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whitney, Wintermeyer, Wren, Yaremko—54.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Messrs. Cass, Child, Davies, Elliott, Frost (Bracondale), Fishleigh, Gisborn, Gordon, Hanna, Hunt, Kerr, Lyons, Manley, Murdoch, Pryde, Worton—16.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs. Collings, Davies, Edwards, Elliott, Doucett, Hanna, Janes, Kerr, MacDonald, Murdoch, Pryde, Scott, Whicher, Wintermeyer—14.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Davies, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gisborn, Gordon, Grossman, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Manley, Morin, Murdoch, Parry, Pryde, Sutton—14.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Beckett, Boyer, Brandon, Cass, Child, Collings, Cowling, Doucett, Dymond, Edwards, Graham, Grossman, Hunt, Jackson, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Kennedy, Lavergne, Lewis, Macaulay, Maloney, Manley, Monaghan, Morin, Murdoch, Myers, Pryde, Rankin,

Reaume, Robarts, Robson, Root, Scott, Spence, Spooner, Stewart, Sutton, Thomas (Oshawa), Villeneuve, Whicher, Whitney, Wintermeyer, Worton, Yaremko—46.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Messrs. Beckett, Brandon, Hall, Macaulay, Maloney, Noden, Parry, Robarts, Root, Thomas (Oshawa), Wintermeyer, Worton, Yaremko—13.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Belisle, Boyer, Cass, Chaput, Child, Connell, Doucett, Dymond, Edwards, Fullerton, Hall, Hanna, Herbert, Hunt, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnston (Carleton), Kennedy, Lavergne, Letherby, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Manley, Morningstar, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Oliver, Parry, Patrick, Pryde, Rankin, Robson, Root, Scott, Spence, Sutton, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whicher, Whitney—44.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

#### COMMITTEE ON GAME AND FISH

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Boyer, Cass, Connell, Doucett, Elliott, Fullerton, Gisborn, Hall, Herbert, Innes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolley, Kerr, Lavergne, Letherby, Lewis, Lyons, Mackenzie, Maloney, Manley, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Nixon, Noden, Pryde, Rankin, Robson, Root, Sandercock, Scott, Spence, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whicher, Whitney—39.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.



## COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

Messrs. Belisle, Child, Collings, Elliott, Fishleigh, Gisborn, Grossman, Herbert, Jackson, Jolley, Lavergne, Lewis, Monaghan, Morningstar, Murdoch, Noden, Pryde, Reaume, Robarts, Wardrope, Wintermeyer, Worton, Yaremko—23.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 7 members.

## COMMITTEE ON MINING

Messrs. Belisle, Brandon, Elliott, Fullerton, Herbert, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Lavergne, Lyons, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Manley, Monaghan, Murdoch, Nixon, Noden, Price, Pryde, Robson, Sandercock, Spooner, Wardrope, Wren—23.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 7 members.

## COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS

Messrs. Connell, Cowling, Frost (Bracondale), Grossman, Hall, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Kerr, Macaulay, MacDonald, Murdoch, Nixon, Patrick, Price, Pryde, Robarts, Robson, Sutton, Villeneuve, Whicher, Whitney, Wintermeyer, Yaremko—23.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 7 members.

## COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND FORESTS

Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Belisle, Boyer, Chaput, Connell, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Gordon, Graham, Herbert, Hunt, Innes, Jackson, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Lavergne, Letherby, Lyons, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Maloney, Monaghan, Morrow, Murdoch, Myers, Noden, Oliver, Price, Pryde, Robson, Sandercock, Scott, Spence, Spooner, Sutton, Villeneuve, Wardrope, Worton, Wren—39.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

## COMMITTEE ON TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

Messrs. Auld, Beckett, Belisle, Boyer, Chaput, Cowling, Dymond, Edwards, Elliott, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Grossman, Hanna, Johnston (Parry Sound), Jolley, Letherby, Lewis, Mackenzie, Morin, Murdoch, Noden, Pryde, Reaume, Root, Stewart, Thomas (Oshawa), Wardrope, Whitney, Worton, Wren—30.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 7 members.

## COMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Messrs. Auld, Boyer, Child, Connell, Cowling, Dymond, Edwards, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracondale), Fullerton, Graham, Grossman, Hanna, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Johnston (Carleton), Jolley, Kerr, Mackenzie, Maloney, Monaghan, Morin, Morningstar, Morrow, Murdoch, Oliver, Parry, Price, Pryde, Reaume, Robson, Root, Stewart, Sutton, Thomas (Oshawa), Wardrope, Whicher, Wintermeyer, Worton, Yaremko—41.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 9 members.

## COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION

Messrs. Cass, Cowling, Gisborn, Hall, Hunt, Innes, Jackson, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Kennedy, Letherby, Lewis, Mackenzie, Manley, Monaghan, Murdoch, Myers, Pryde, Root, Sandercock, Spence, Stewart, Villeneuve, Wardrope—24.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of 5 members.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to understand immediately just what was in the minds of those who set up the number of hon. members to

serve on these various committees. The present Legislature has 8 more members than it had previously and it would stand to reason, therefore, that the committees in the main would be as large, if not larger, than were those at previous sessions.

I make particular reference to one committee—that on Public Accounts—which, according to what the Clerk has read, in the last Legislature was composed of 52 members, while this year there are to be but 14. It seems to me some explanation should be forthcoming from the government in respect to this matter.

It may be suggested by the hon. Prime Minister that the Public Accounts Committee had not met for 2 or 3 years. I can say to the hon. Prime Minister now that it is very likely that the Public Accounts Committee will meet, not once, but several times within the life of the present Legislature, and it would seem to me, therefore, that to cut the membership of what will very likely be an important committee, from 52 to 14, is doing what is not in the best interests of the Legislature and the hon. members.

I would like to hear the hon. Prime Minister on that particular point.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is the first I have heard of this particular matter, but as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, there were representatives of all parties on the Striking Committee. The matter of reducing the number of hon. members on the Public Accounts Committee to 14 appeared to me at first to be a ridiculous thing. As far as I am concerned, I do not care how many hon. members are on these committees, I would like to see all the hon. members possible on them—having regard to the capacity of the rooms—which would seem proper procedure.

The Clerk of the House tells me, in the absence of the chairman of the Striking Committee, that what happened

was, the hon. members were all asked upon what committees they desired to serve, and there were only 14 who were willing to serve on the Public Accounts Committee. However, I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I will consider this carefully. I have some nominations I would like to make, and I will ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he will do the same—

MR. OLIVER: We will make as many as you like.

HON. MR. FROST: The motion will be amended on Monday.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you.

HON. MR. FROST: I would also ask the hon. members to look over the list of committees, and if there is a committee, or committees, upon which an hon. member would like to serve—again having regard to the capacity of the rooms in which these hearings are held—to advise his Party Whip or the Clerk of the House and, as far as possible, I will be very glad to see that his wish is acceded to.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, while I am on my feet, may I ask your indulgence to change the order of procedure to this extent.

I received an invitation—rather a limited invitation, as a matter of fact—from the Canadian General Electric Company, which has a film of the progress of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I understand from the invitation I received they are having private showings here, and in Ottawa. It occurred to me that the hon. members of the House would like to see that film which, I understand, is very short, only about half or three-quarters of an hour, so I asked Mr. Turner of the Canadian General Electric Company if he would agree to have the film shown in the Government Members' Room at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon. All hon. members of the House and the Press Gallery are invited.

I understand the film shows some of the work being done, and some of the background in connection with that big undertaking. No doubt there are many here who will be interested, and desirous of viewing the film.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion that the report be adopted which was present a moment or two ago not having carried, I would suggest that we might carry it, on the understanding that additions may be made to the memberships of the different committees by way of motions in the next week.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Clerk or you, Mr. Speaker, if the list of members of the Committee on Government Commissions was read?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.  
Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.  
Introduction of Bills.

#### ONTARIO HIGHWAY TRANSPORT BOARD ACT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are a few small amendments to the Act in order to clarify the duties and the powers of the board.

#### MUNICIPAL ARBITRATIONS ACT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Arbitrations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments are to clarify the interpretations in the Act in respect to the appointment of arbitrators in the municipalities.

#### FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are 6 changes in the Act, the first section is extending the meaning of "owner" to include the holder of licences and permits under The Public Lands Act and The Provincial Parks Act, 1954. The others are just routine.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. ALLAN GROSSMAN (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I should like the privilege of directing a question to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) in view of an article which appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail* in which it was stated that the Toronto Board of Education last night voted to remove the story of "Little Black Sambo" from the school libraries.

Will the hon. Minister of Education inform the House if his department has considered the possibility of adopting such a policy in respect to books being removed from the public schools in this province?

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, there has been no attempt to give consideration to the matter in question, but I can assure the hon. member that it is our policy in the Department of Education to give serious consideration to any suggestion which is made and that will be done in this case.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:



1. The Annual Report of The Ontario Research Foundation for the calendar year 1954.

2. The 38th Annual Report of The Civil Service Commission for Ontario for the year ended March 31, 1955.

3. The 46th Annual Report of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the year ended December 31, 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before

moving the adjournment of the House, may I inform the House that on Monday we shall proceed with the introduction of Bills and, possibly, some second readings. On Tuesday, we shall proceed with the debate on the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.35 of the clock, p.m.



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Monday, February 6, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Monday, February 6, 1956

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Report of Committees .....  | 57 |
| Female Employees' Fair Remuneration Act, 1951, Bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald,<br>first reading .....     | 59 |
| Presentation of Reports, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 59 |
| Department of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading ..                         | 60 |
| Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop,<br>second reading ..... | 62 |
| Separate Schools Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, second reading .....                                   | 63 |
| Entry of Horses at Exhibitions Act, Bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, second reading ..                      | 63 |
| County Court Judges Criminal Courts Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts,<br>second reading .....            | 63 |
| Credit Unions Act, 1953, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                               | 64 |
| Crown Witnesses Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                                   | 64 |
| Jurors Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....  | 64 |
| Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act, Bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                        | 64 |
| Insurance Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....   | 64 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 65 |



# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: This being the fourth anniversary of the Coronation of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, I would ask hon. members to join in a special prayer for the occasion.

Almighty God, who rulest over all the kingdoms of the world, and dost order them according to Thy good pleasure: We yield Thee unfeigned thanks, for that Thou wast pleased, as on this day, to set Thy servant our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth, upon the throne of this realm. Let Thy wisdom be her guide, and let Thine arm strengthen her; let truth and justice, holiness and righteousness, peace and charity, abound in her days; direct all her counsels and endeavours to Thy glory, and the welfare of her subjects; give us grace to obey her cheerfully for conscience's sake, and let her always possess the hearts of her people; let her reign be long and prosperous, and crown her with everlasting life in the world to come; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petition has been received:

Of the Corporation of the Town of Brampton, praying that an Act may pass authorizing municipal parking lots; one-half the capital and maintenance

costs of which shall be levied against the occupants of the lands in a defined area; and for related purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. L. M. Frost moves that members be added to the standing committees in accordance with the attached list.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had better explain this before the motion is put. It arises from the mention made on Friday last by the hon. leader of the Opposition about the number of members on the Public Accounts Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, following Friday's session, I looked over the list of members and I find that in nearly all of the committees there are more members than last year, with the exception of 5: the Committee on Standing Orders, the Committee on Public Accounts, the Committee on Legal Bills, the Committee on Game and Fish, and the Committee on Mining.

It seems to me desirable that all those committees should have members added to them, so I have prepared this motion. I will not read the names, Mr. Speaker, I will leave that for yourself and the Clerk of the House. I simply make the motion which I have read, and which I shall read again.

In regard to the Committee on Private Bills, we have a request from one member that he be added.

On the Committee on Standing Orders, I am proposing that there should be 10 names added. That is a

committee, Mr. Speaker, which is associated with the machinery of government. I know the work would be quite well done by the members whose names were placed upon the committee here last Friday, but I think it is desirable that more members should be there because, as I say, it is a committee that is associated with the machinery of government.

On the Committee on Public Accounts, I am proposing that there should be 35 members added to that committee. Last year, the Committee on Public Accounts consisted of 52 members. This year there are only 14. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that the Striking Committee met and used the names of those who asked to be on particular committees.

For instance, on the Committee on Health there were 41 members last year but there are a very great many more this year who are interested in that particular subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am recommending and asking the House to appoint some 35 additional members to that committee.

On the Committee on Legal Bills, Mr. Speaker, last year there were 24 members. This year there are 13. Again following the desires of the members, as indicated to the various members of the committee, I am proposing, Mr. Speaker, that there should be an additional 10 members added to that committee.

Concerning the Committee on Legal Bills: since some very important legislation will go before that committee, I think it desirable that the committee should be enlarged.

The Committee on Game and Fish deals with a matter which is related to one of our great natural resources and it seemed to me that the committee should be approximately what it was last year, when there were 51 members on that committee. This year there are 39, so I am proposing that 10 additional members be added to that committee.

On the Mining Committee, this year there are 23 members. Last year there were 34. I am proposing that there

should be an additional 10 members added to that committee. There are one or two members who have since indicated their desire to be on the Mining Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the committees are so large it is quite obvious that, on days upon which one or two or more committees will meet, there will be occasions when all of the members on a committee cannot be present. But this will give hon. members an opportunity of choosing the committee in whose particular work they would be interested on any particular day. So, Mr. Speaker, I move that the members be added to the standing committees, in accordance with the attached list.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that members be added to the standing committees in accordance with the attached list.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Monaghan.

#### COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Belisle, Connell, Edwards, Fullerton, MacDonald, Graham, Rankin, Robson.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Auld, Beckett, Brandon, Cass, Cowling, Dymond, Fishleigh, Frost (Bracendale), Graham, Grossman, Hall, Johnston (Parry Sound), Lavergne, Letherby, Lyons, Macaulay, Maloney, Monaghan, Morrow, Myers, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Robarts, Root, Sandercock, Stewart, Sutton, Thomas (Oshawa), Villeneuve, Wardrope, Whitney, Worton, Yaremko.

#### COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Herbert, Hunt, Morrow, MacDonald, Myers, Nixon, Price, Rankin, Spooner, Wardrope.

## COMMITTEE ON GAME AND FISH

Brandon, Child, Cowling, Dymond,  
Gordon, Jackson, Johnston (Carleton),  
Patrick, Sutton, Thomas (Oshawa).

## COMMITTEE ON MINING

Beckett, Cass, Fishleigh, Gisborn,  
Hanna, Janes, Jolley, Morin, Sutton,  
Worton.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of  
Bills.

## THE FEMALE EMPLOYEES' FAIR REMUNERATION ACT, 1951

Mr. D. MacDonald (York South)  
moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An  
Act to amend The Female Employees'  
Fair Remuneration Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the  
Bill.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of  
Labour): Mr. Speaker, may the hon.  
member give a brief explanation?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker,  
the Act as it now stands has a phrase-  
ology with regard to "the same employ-  
ment," and experience has indicated that  
the phrase "the same employment" is  
one which is so broadly interpreted in  
experience, that it becomes meaningless.  
The amendment which is proposed in  
this Bill is to substitute what has proven  
from wide experience to be a more effec-  
tive phraseology. Incidentally, it is in  
exactly the phraseology of the Bill intro-  
duced for some years by Conservative  
members in the federal House. There-  
fore, I am looking forward with some  
confidence to support for the Bill from  
the government ranks.

Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR  
(Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker,  
I beg leave to present to the House as  
follows:

(1) Annual Report of the Ontario  
College of Art, for the fiscal year ended  
May 31, 1955.

(2) Report of the Minister of Educa-  
tion for the calendar year 1954.

(3) Annual Report of the Teachers'  
Superannuation Commission, for the  
year ended October 31, 1955.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime  
Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the  
Orders of the day, I desire to say some-  
thing in connection with the Winter  
Olympic Games, which terminated last  
Saturday.

I understand that the hon. member for  
Waterloo North will have something to  
say on the same subject. I presume I  
will want to be associated with what he  
says and I trust he will want to be asso-  
ciated with what I say.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I caused a  
telegram to be sent to the members of  
that team. Before reading it—and I  
hope it meets with the approval of the  
hon. members of the House—I wish to  
point out that all hon. members here  
regard the Kitchener-Waterloo Dutch-  
men as fine young Canadians, who have  
been thoroughly representative of our  
province.

In paying tribute to them, my mind is  
taken back a very great many years, to  
about the time of the First World War,  
when teams from that city boasted of  
such players as George Hainsworth,  
"Butch" Truchinski, and others. They  
were great hockey players in their day,  
and were actually in many ways the  
founders of the present National Hockey  
League. Some of those players were  
among the most outstanding players  
Canada ever produced.

Mr. Speaker, this team which went to  
represent Canada at the present Olympics  
is a representative team. They are by no  
means a team of all-stars. They were a  
team chosen from teams playing across  
Canada, and they won in their class and  
accordingly won the right to carry our  
colours overseas at Cortina. They have  
done an excellent job there, as would  
any other team which would have been  
chosen in that competition to represent  
our country.



Mr. Speaker, in our land — and we like others to understand our position — the gauge is not victory; but it is the way the game is played, and sportsmanship displayed. I would say that these young fellows went across there as a representative team from our country, chosen as a team capturing the championship of Canada in their amateur class, and they have brought honour to our land and we are very proud of them indeed.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our people I have sent them this telegram:

As you left Kitchener for Cortina on January fourteenth, I sent you a message of encouragement and goodwill. On behalf of the government and the people of Ontario, now I salute you as a great-hearted team on your return from the Olympic Winter Games. There, in the spirit of true sportsmanship, in a cleanly-played game, you brought great credit to yourselves and to Canada, in the magnificent effort put forth as Canada's entry in the Olympic hockey play-offs of 1956.

As an amateur Canadian hockey team which won the championship of its class here, your fellow Canadians applaud you for the way in which you held the winners at Cortina to so small a margin. We are all proud of you, and with the people of Ontario I say "welcome home" in sincere and warm-hearted terms.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to associate what remarks I have to make with those that have been so kindly made by the hon. Prime Minister.

This is a sad day for the area that I represent, and I can assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that your words will be a source of real consolation to the people of Waterloo North.

The team to which the hon. Prime Minister has referred, Mr. Speaker, is an amateur team of great ability. On 2 occasions during the past 3 years, that same team has had the distinction of winning the Allen Cup, symbolic of championship senior hockey in the

Dominion of Canada, and before that same team left for Cortina a few weeks back, they led their league in number of games they have won this year. Therefore, I think they have demonstrated the right to be chosen as representatives of Canada.

As I say, they are an amateur team, and a team of real ability. As the hon. Prime Minister has said, they have done honour to Canada, even in the unfortunate defeat they suffered.

During the games, and particularly during those scheduled in Czechoslovakia before the Olympic Games proper, they did for us something that only sportsmen and players in sport can do. That is, they bought something in the nature of good-will, which cannot be purchased in any other way.

Judging by the newspaper comments, I have gathered that they did that in an admirable fashion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, in spite of their defeat, they have demonstrated the ability to play hockey in an expert fashion, and probably what is more important, they have demonstrated to those people, particularly behind the Iron Curtain, the spirit of good sportsmanship in public games.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the comments which have been made by the hon. Prime Minister, and to suggest to this House that the Kitchener-Waterloo Dutchmen are deserving of the compliments and congratulations which this hon. House has extended to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

Hon. W. J. Dunlop (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 47, "An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1954."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill intitled, "An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1954," introduces an extremely important activity of the Department of Education.

We are asking for authority to make agreements with the hon. Minister of Labour of the Dominion Government in order that we may be able to go more extensively into the matter of providing assistance for young people who wish to obtain higher education.

The amount of money involved is \$425,000; of this amount, \$325,000 is provided by the Government of Ontario, and \$100,000 by the Dominion Government.

We are hoping, Mr. Speaker, that there may be more from the second source I mentioned. Indeed, we have discussed the possibility with the hon. Minister of Labour and with the hon. Minister of Finance at Ottawa in regard to larger contributions to enable us to do more for the young people who are coming in increasing numbers to the institutions of higher learning in this province.

These "bursaries" or "scholarships"—we call them one or the other without much distinction—are awarded as far as possible, feasible, and appropriate, according to the different counties and according to the population of those counties.

The hon. members of the House may be interested to know that in the present year, 1955-1956, students are enjoying 1,610 of these bursaries, made up of 522 for the last year of high school, teachers' college year, and the first year at the university, and 1,088 of these bursaries or scholarships for later years of training at the university level.

Some students, according to need, obtain scholarships amounting to \$500 each, which is a great increase over scholarships awarded in earlier years.

So it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, we have this great work going on assisting young people and making it possible, in a great many instances, for them to obtain an education which otherwise they would not be able to secure.

I have an application form here, and may I say that anyone who applies for a bursary or scholarship—which is called the "Dominion-Provincial Students' Aid Bursary"—must have a good

academic standing. No one is given a bursary who has lower than an average of 66 per cent. in a previous examination, which often is the grade XIII examination, and, of course, need for assistance must be proven.

Another important factor in awarding these bursaries is what a student does to help himself or herself; for example, in the summer holidays, other holidays, after-school work and so on.

If this amendment is approved, we shall be able to go on and do more of this work and we hope to make it really possible for the young people anywhere in this province, who are worthwhile in the matter of academic standing, and whose need is such that they cannot finance themselves but who are willing to work for themselves, to advance their education.

If this amendment to The Department of Education Act is approved, we shall be able to do more than we have been able to do so far.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, may I say that this Act will, of course, go to the Committee on Education. There it can be discussed in detail, and in an informal way.

I would like to point out that in organizing the House for business, it was necessary to bring certain legislation to a point where it can go to the committees, and that is the purpose of the work which will be done this afternoon.

All of the Bills moved for second reading this afternoon will go to the various committees of the House, but before these committees can function, it is necessary that certain legislation be sent to them.

In making that statement I am not saying, by any means, that debate is not to be encouraged on these various motions. There may be points in which hon. members will be particularly interested in connection with the principles involved in these Bills.

In most cases, these Bills are of a nature where the various sections are

independent; the principle of one section, of course, may not apply to another, and, therefore, they do not come into the class of some other Bills where the particular principle which is covered by the Bill is the principle upon which the Bill is based.

With that explanation, we will proceed with some of the other motions here, in ordinary course.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves second reading of Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954."

He said: This Act, Mr. Speaker, provides for one situation which has arisen in Ontario, and another which may arise at any time. As the hon. members of the House are aware, we are trying always, so far as it seems to be in the best interest of the people, to form township school areas, and high school districts, in order that the young people may get the very best education, and also, Mr. Speaker, to carry out the principle which to us is extremely important—that is, to provide equality of opportunity for all of the young people of this province.

That means we are always being asked to do something about forming a high school district, or a township school area, so that the children may be transported to a central spot where they may obtain the very best which can be given to them in the way of education. It also does away with having these very little schools in some parts of the province, with very small enrolments, but the pupils to be taken to schools where the classes are larger.

In this particular case, there are in the village of Westport, Ont., two Continuation Schools, formed many years ago. These two Continuation Schools in this village would be, in ordinary circumstances, taken into the high school

district which is being formed there, known as the "North Leeds High School District."

But, as hon. members will realize, we have to be careful that no hardship is inflicted in the case of the supporters of either one of these Continuation Schools who do not wish to come into the high school district. One is the "Public Continuation School," as we may call it, and the other is the "Separate Continuation School."

The supporters of the Separate Continuation School prefer to remain out of the high school district—at least in the meantime—while the others would like to come in.

If this amendment did not pass, then there is no means by which we could prevent double taxation for supporters of one of these two Continuation Schools, so we are asking for this amendment to the Act in order that the Separate Continuation School, whose supporters wish to remain out of the high school district, may do so, and may not be called upon to pay taxes both for the high school district and their own Separate Continuation School. That is the first section of the Bill.

The second section, one might think should not be necessary, but it is, because questions of all sorts come up at school meetings. The second section is designed to define "ratepayers," and we are defining a "ratepayer" as: "A man or woman whose name is entered on the last revised assessment roll."

With this explanation, I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly.

MR. NIXON: How many Separate Continuation Schools are there in the province, and is there legislation which regulates and sets them up?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Speaker, we have two in Westport, and two in Eganville. Eganville has taken no action in this respect. There are other Separate



Continuation Schools, but not two in the same village, excepting the two places I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves second reading of Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act."

He said: As the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, all these Bills will go to the Committee on Education after second reading.

This first section of this Bill involves the striking out of only one word in the clause in The Separate Schools Act, and the reason for striking out that one word is this: let me give an example.

There are two adjoining School Sections, one of which does not have a Separate School. The two Sections, as I say, are adjoining. There is a man who lives in Section No. 2, who is a supporter of the Separate School in Section No. 1, and he attends the school meetings, and somebody rises and says, "Hold on, you are a resident of Section No. 2; you cannot vote here."

The other gentleman says, "Of course I can vote, because I am supporting this school, and I live within 3 miles of it."

Then he is asked to file a certificate that he is a supporter of that school, although living in Section No. 2.

This proposed amendment makes it fair for every supporter of a Separate School, under those circumstances, to vote at the school meetings.

The second section deals with the time for holding meetings. In the Act as it stands, the time given is 7 o'clock in the evening, which does not afford very much time for finishing up things at home and getting to the meetings, so we are asking that the time of holding the meetings be changed from 7 o'clock to 8 o'clock.

I might mention, in passing, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of pupils—girls and boys—in the west gallery today who come from a Separate

School in my own constituency, and they may be interested to know that no one has noticed for many years that there was no authority for a teacher in the Separate Schools to suspend a pupil who did not behave.

I presume that it was because they behaved so well that this was never noticed.

A teacher in the Public Schools may suspend an unruly pupil, but, so far, a teacher in the Separate Schools can not, and the purpose of Section 3 of the amendment is to see that all teachers have the same authority to suspend unruly students.

I move second reading of Bill No. 49.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## ENTRY OF HORSES AT EXHIBITIONS ACT

Hon. A. Kelso Roberts (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to repeal the Entry of Horses at Exhibitions Act."

He said: The old Act, passed in 1891, was designed to prevent improper practices in connection with the entries of horses for harness races. These matters are now in the hands of The Ontario Racing Commission, and The Canadian Trotting Association, so the original Act is obsolete, and I think it would be proper to repeal it at this time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## COUNTY COURT JUDGES CRIMINAL COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The County Court Judges Criminal Courts Act."

He said: This Bill provides that the Clerk of the Peace for the county or district shall be the Clerk of the County Court Judges Criminal Courts. That has been the practice, but it requires statutory authority for the existing practice.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act, 1953."

He said: This Bill contains a dozen or more amendments designed to assist credit unions in their operations, and to bring the Act into line with existing practices.

The Bill has been developed by the Superintendent of Insurance in collaboration with The Credit Union League, which represents substantially all of the credit unions in the province. I think the explanatory notes are quite clear, and it will go to the Legal Bills Committee.

I may say I had the opportunity of discussing this matter with The Credit Union League when it was in session a few weeks ago, on a number of different points, and also they have agreed to study, with the officials of my department, the whole question of auditing, and I suspect that at some time in the near future we will have other recommendations for further amendments to this Bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 43, intituled, "An Act to amend the Crown Witnesses Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill increases the fee allowed Crown witnesses attending the trial of indictable offences from \$3 a day to \$4 a day, to bring it into line with the fee in summary conviction cases under the new Criminal Code.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 44, intituled, "An Act to amend the Jurors Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Act now requires two justices of the peace to be

present at the drafting of panels from jury lists. The Bill removes this unnecessary requirement. The fee is very nominal, and considerable difficulty has always been experienced in obtaining two justices. By eliminating this provision, panels hereafter will be drafted by the sheriff in the presence of the clerk of the peace. As hon. members know, that is done by ballot with the use of an urn, and the whole procedure is very clearly set out in the Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE MAGISTRATES' JURISDICTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 45, intituled, "An Act to repeal The Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act."

He said: This Act was passed in 1929, has not been amended since, and no cases are reported on it. It is felt that it serves no useful purpose and that it causes a great deal of unnecessary confusion and "red tape" in the appointment of magistrates. I consider it obsolete, and that it should be repealed, and, therefore, move second reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 46, intituled, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act."

He said: This is a fairly voluminous Bill. It represents the latest thinking in this particular type of insurance and is an effort to join with other provinces in what might be termed "uniform insurance law." It applies particularly to fire, health and sickness regulations, and contains a general revision of the fire insurance and the accident and sickness insurance parts of the Act.

The revision has been drafted following a conference of Superintendents of Insurance in Canada and it is expected

that similar legislation will be introduced in other provinces at their current sessions, and that the provision will be brought into force in each province by proclamation on the same day.

I could give the House an explanation of the Bill at considerable length. It will go to the Legal Bills Committee, but there are one or two points I should like to mention.

The statutory conditions have been very much abbreviated and the definition of "peril of fire" very much clarified. There is one provision in the Act which makes it clear, for example, that there is a prohibition against giving undue prominence to the benefit provisions of a policy as compared with its restrictions, because many insurers do not read the policies carefully, due to their length. The statutory conditions should be no longer than necessary and, in the provisions, the statutory conditions have been shortened without sacrifice of purpose.

There are many other details in the Bill which will be clearly seen when it comes before the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will proceed with the debate on the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. At that time I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) will take the floor.

MR. OLIVER: Is that tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: That is tomorrow; and after that the other hon. members will have their say in connection with the good deeds, or otherwise, of this government.

With the introduction of the Bills today the committees will very soon begin to function. I am hopeful that each committee will have a programme not only involving the Bills themselves, but involving the general workings of various departments, upon which to give reports to hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.00 of the clock, p.m.







# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Tuesday, February 7, 1956**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Griesinger, first reading                          | 69  |
| <b>Public Schools Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Dunlop, first reading .....  | 69  |
| <b>Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology Act</b> , Bill to establish,<br>Mr. Dunlop, first reading ..... | 69  |
| <b>Beach Protection Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, first reading .....   | 70  |
| <b>Conservation Authorities Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Nickle, first reading .....                                | 70  |
| <b>Territorial Division Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading .....                                | 70  |
| <b>Railway Fire Charge Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....                                 | 70  |
| <b>Limited Partnerships Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....                                   | 71  |
| <b>Fire Marshals Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 71  |
| <b>Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts,<br>first reading .....        | 71  |
| <b>Summary Convictions Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....                                    | 71  |
| <b>Land Titles Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 72  |
| <b>Conveyancing and Law of Property Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading                             | 72  |
| <b>Estates Tail Act</b> , Bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 73  |
| <b>Fraudulent Conveyances Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....                                 | 73  |
| <b>Limitations Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 73  |
| <b>Real Property Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 73  |
| <b>Settled Estates Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....  | 73  |
| <b>Crown Timber Act, 1952</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....                                  | 73  |
| <b>Highway Improvement Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading .....                                      | 73  |
| <b>Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading .....                               | 75  |
| <b>Public Service Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading .....  | 75  |
| <b>Marriage Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading .....  | 75  |
| <b>Presentation of Reports</b> , Mr. Dunbar .....   | 76  |
| <b>Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne</b> , Mr. Oliver, Mr. Frost ....                              | 76  |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate</b> , Mr. MacDonald, agreed to .....  | 103 |
| <b>Motion to adjourn</b> , Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 103 |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1956

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the house having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

MR SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

Hon. W. Griesinger moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Act are very simple and are merely to clarify the difference between drainage work in organized and unorganized territories, and also to give a further clarification to the word "grant" and the word "aid".

### THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. W. J. Dunlop moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for 6 rather minor amendments to The Public Schools Act and is to be referred to the Committee on Education. I will explain it further, if desired.

### THE LAKEHEAD COLLEGE OF ARTS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill goes also to the Committee on Education. I may possibly have an opportunity to deal with it more fully on second reading. However, in the meantime, may I outline the general principle of this Bill.

We have had at the Lakehead—between Port Arthur and Fort William—for some 8 or 9 years, what is known as the Lakehead Technical Institute. That Institution has been entirely under The Department of Education. It has provided courses in technical subjects and has also provided instruction in the work of the first year in Arts, Mining, Forestry, Commerce and Household Economics. Those who have completed the first year in the Institute are accepted into second year classes in the universities in southern Ontario.

The people of that section of the province have now raised \$175,000. The

Councils of Fort William and Port Arthur have each undertaken to provide \$10,000 a year. The government proposes to erect a building on a new site, at an expenditure of about \$350,000 plus the \$175,000 to be used for a wing. When that is completed—we hope construction may begin almost immediately—this Junior College will then be able to provide instruction in second year courses, as well as first year in Arts, Mining, Forestry and so on. It then will be an independent Junior College, managed and operated by a Board of Governors, as provided for in this Bill.

### THE BEACH PROTECTION ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Beach Protection Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill effects a change in the licence which will be required to remove gravel from Lake Erie. The Bill will be referred to The Standing Committee on Mining.

### THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

Hon. W. M. Nickle moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Conservation Authorities Act, by adding thereto the following sections:

The new section 4a constitutes an authority to be known as The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority which includes the present conservation authorities set up in the Metropolitan Area and surrounding territory.

The new section 17 gives authority to a conservation authority, subject to the approval of the Minister, to make regulations with respect to the subject matter set out in the section.

In this section, "Metropolitan Conservation Authority" means The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

There is hereby constituted an authority to be known as The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

The Etobicoke-Mimico Conservation Authority, The Humber Valley Conservation Authority, The Don Valley Conservation Authority, and the Rouge, Duffin, Highland, Petticoat Conservation Authority established under this Act are hereby dissolved.

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the townships of Adjala, Albion, Caledon, Chinguacousy, King, Markham, Mono, Pickering, Toronto, Toronto Gore, Uxbridge, Vaughan and Whitechurch, the towns of Ajax and Brampton and the villages of Bolton, Markham, Pickering, Richmond Hill, Stouffville and Woodbridge, are hereby designated as the participating municipalities in The Metropolitan Conservation Authority, for the purposes of this Act.

### THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that, where there is a dispute between municipalities as to where an island belongs, the Municipal Board will be able to adjudicate on the matter.

### THE RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is designed to bring the procedure

into line with the procedure set up in The Provincial Land Tax Act. This overcomes a duplication in administration and in the case of small holdings it will end the double taxation on the parcels of land which were subject to the Provincial Land Tax. Parcels of land under 200 acres, which are not subject to the Provincial Land Tax, are subject to the Railway Fire Charge Act. This amendment provides that the charge will be reduced from \$12.80 to \$6.

A further amendment provides that The Railway Fire Charge Act will not apply when the lands, wherever situate, are used in connection with a place of worship, church yard, cemetery or burying grounds.

#### THE LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this and other Bills to be read for the first time will be referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

#### THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): I would be grateful if the hon. Attorney-General could follow a precedent which

has been used in the House recently, that of making a statement on each Bill. There are 3 in a row and I would be interested in hearing something, first, on The Limited Partnerships Act, and then something on The Fire Marshals Act, and now the present one.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will revert and do just that. The first Bill is The Limited Partnerships Amendment Act, 1956. A certificate of limited partnership under The Limited Partnerships Act is required to be filed in the office of the County Court Clerk. This Bill will change the place of filing and will require the certificates to be filed in the same place as declarations under The Partnerships Act in the registry offices. This is designed to make it more simple for making searches and the keeping of records.

With respect to The Fire Marshals Act, the provision in its present form is unduly restrictive, as it may be desired to make grants for associations, leagues or institutions organized for the encouragement of fire prevention but which are not incorporated.

The amendment will make it possible to make grants to unincorporated as well as incorporated associations of that kind.

In regard to The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, a new subsection will be added to section 2 of that Act. It will provide that when funds come into any of the court offices—to the accountant of the Supreme Court, for example—from a foreign jurisdiction or foreign territory, they must be converted into Canadian currency, in order that the Act will be in line with The Currency Maintenance and Exchange Act.

#### THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.



He said: Mr. Speaker, this Act contains certain amendments, as follows:

An amendment to incorporate section 20 of the Criminal Code, in order that a warrant or summons may be issued on a Sunday or statutory holiday in a summary conviction matter.

Fines imposed on corporations convicted by summary conviction may be collected by distress and sale of goods of the corporation.

This will expedite collection. The only other way now is to register the conviction in the Supreme Court. Provision is made for an appeal by a complainant on a question of law alone from the County Court to the Court of Appeal. Part XXIV of the Criminal Code, incorporating into it The Summary Convictions Act, does not appear to provide this appeal.

The hon. members of the House will recall that it was not possible in a recent case—which has become known as the “Dresden case”—some time back, for an appeal to be taken by the complainant in the particular case on a question of law. If this enactment is passed, that situation will not arise in the future.

## THE LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, “An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.”

Motion agreed to; first reading of Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular Act will provide for the appointment of another Deputy Master, in addition to the present Deputy Master, in order to cope with the volume of business now being done. It provides for the appointment of a Director and Deputy Director of Titles, whose duties will be of a supervisory nature.

There are some other amendments in the Act but, unless some hon. member wants me to enumerate them one by one, I will let it go at that.

Mr. Speaker, I have some 6 Acts for first reading which all concern the

same general matter. These amendments are to 6 different Acts, and, if I may, I will just mention their purposes. Unless you prefer me to move them together at this time and then explain later, with your permission I will explain first.

The purpose of these 6 Acts is to bring about an abolition of what is known as “Estates Tail.” Hon. members, other than lawyers—and some lawyers other than myself—may not be familiar with that term in too great detail. I would explain that it came into law in this province many years ago, when the Common Law of England became the law of the land. It had the effect, in feudal days, of keeping an estate in the issue, whether it be male or female, or in some other form—that is, in the possession of the relatives of the grantor.

It gradually disappeared in England. It was abolished in British Columbia in 1921, in Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1906, in Nova Scotia in 1851, in New Brunswick in 1854. There are none of these estates in Manitoba and none in Newfoundland. There has been none in this particular area, in Toronto, since 1900 and I have not been able to locate any in Ontario since 1880, where one in the Chatham area was created.

The amendments as contained in these several Acts will have the effect of abolishing that particular type of conveyance of land, preserving all necessary and proper safeguards for any existing cases.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I will introduce these Bills in order.

## THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 66 intituled, “An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.”

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE ESTATES TAIL ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 67 intituled, "An Act to repeal The Estates Tail Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 68 intituled, "An Act to amend The Fraudulent Conveyances Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE LIMITATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 69 intituled, "An Act to amend The Limitations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## REAL PROPERTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill No. 70 intituled, "An Act to amend an Act respecting Real Property."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE SETTLED ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Settled Estates Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CROWN TIMBER ACT, 1952

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Section 1: this new section will ensure a definite supply of timber

to a mill over a term of years, and will also make available timber for other purposes from any particular area of public lands.

Section 2: subsection 1 of section 6 of the Act now provides for surveys in licenced areas. The new subsection will provide for similar surveys in unlicenced areas.

Section 3: self-explanatory.

Section 4: the making of a declaration must be authorized by Statute before the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting false declarations apply.

Section 5: the present requirement that cutting records be verified by oath is deleted.

Section 6: the Crown lien for charges is extended to cover all timber of the licensee.

Section 7: the authority to seize timber where Crown charges are owing is broadened.

Section 8: the intent is clarified.

Section 9: the general rule is that provincial forests remain set apart for the production of timber.

The new provision, which qualifies this rule, is self-explanatory.

## THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Section 1: self-explanatory.

Section 2: the word "constructing" is inserted to bring the phraseology in line with the phraseology of the following subsection.

Section 3: this amendment expressly provides for registration where land is under the Land Titles System.

Section 4: the section repealed provides for an arrangement with the Indian Affairs Branch of The Department of Mines and Resources (Canada) for the construction and improvement of a connecting link of a county road

system passing through an Indian reserve. Indian Affairs are now administered by The Department of Citizenship and Immigration (Canada).

As re-enacted the section is intended to overcome the difficulty caused by the transfer of responsibility from one federal department to another and to make the provision applicable to a connecting link of a county road system passing through other lands under the control of the Government of Canada, for example, Welland Canal lands.

Section 5: A county road superintendent who acts as engineer for a suburban roads commission is required to perform additional duties and to assume additional responsibility. The re-enactment provides for extra compensation for these extra services.

Section 6: the amendment brings the provision into line with present administrative practices as township councils require the extra month in which to estimate their road expenditures.

Section 7: Indian Affairs are now administered by The Department of Citizenship and Immigration (Canada). The amendment is intended to overcome the difficulty caused by the transfer of responsibility from one federal department to another. See also section 4 of this Bill.

Section 8: see note to section 6. This amendment is similar.

Section 9: this provision is new. It provides for a system of provincial roads to be known as "secondary roads."

Section 10: subsection 1. The first amendment expressly provides for registration where land is under the Land Titles System. The second amendment will expedite administration by enabling officers other than the Minister or Deputy Minister to sign plans. The third amendment is merely the substitution of a more appropriate word.

Subsection 2: the first amendment expressly provides for registration where land is under the Land Titles System. The second amendment makes a permissive provision mandatory.

Section 11: the purpose of this re-enactment is to clarify and broaden the

government's powers in situations in which an alternative highway or route has been substituted, or where a portion of a highway is no longer required for the purpose, and the like.

Section 12: these amendments will expressly provide for registration where the land is under the Land Titles System.

Power is also given (subsection 2) to enable land plans to be signed by the named departmental officials and by an Ontario land surveyor, thus expediting administration. See also section 10(1) of this Bill.

Section 13: the sections repealed provide for municipal contribution to the cost of the King's Highway. As the province has paid 100 per cent. of this cost since 1935 these sections are repealed as obsolete.

Section 14, subsection 1: see note to section 13 of this Bill. The subsections repealed are obsolete.

Subsection 2: the substituted word is more appropriate.

Subsection 3: the provincial aid now provided by section 78 of the Act for the urban municipalities under the King's Highway connecting link agreements is extended in all cases to a maximum roadway width of 33 feet. Clauses (a), (b) and (c) of subsection 6 are clarified to show how the provisions apply to construction and maintenance in the case of non-separated towns and villages and to construction only in the case of cities and separated towns.

Subsection 4: under subsection 2a of section 58 of the Act as enacted in 1955 a non-separated town or village is entitled to a subsidy of 80 per cent. on expenditure made on a bridge or culvert. This new subsection provides for payment of the same proportion of the expenditure on a bridge or culvert under a King's Highway connecting link agreement in the case of a non-separated town or village having a population of more than 2,500.

Section 15: the wording substituted is more appropriate.

Section 16: the wording substituted is more appropriate.



Section 17: the word substituted is more appropriate.

Section 18: the wording substituted is more appropriate.

Section 19: self-explanatory.

Section 20, subsection 1: the words deleted are obsolete. See note to section 13 of this Bill.

Subsections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7: the words substituted are more appropriate.

Section 21: the amendment makes uniform the phraseology of the subsection.

Section 22: the word substituted is more appropriate.

Section 23: the words substituted are more appropriate.

Section 24, subsection 1: clause (d) which prohibits the doing of the things specified in the clause without a permit from the Minister, is strengthened by the added words in order to make the prohibition more effective.

Subsection 2: This amendment will make the control features with respect to controlled-access highways that are now applicable to the King's Highway applicable to secondary roads and not to development roads. This is complementary to section 9 of this Bill.

Section 25: the word substituted is more appropriate.

Section 26: the words substituted are more appropriate.

Section 27: the words substituted are more appropriate.

### THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile moves first reading of Bill No. 74 intituled, "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. H. A. WORTON (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask for an explanation?

HON. MR. CECILE: Mr. Speaker, there are 3 features in this Act, the first

one being that the words "one year" as inserted where a husband has been a deserter and has not been heard from nor seen for a period of one year, the mother can make application for Mothers' Allowance. We are changing that from "one year" to "6 months."

The second section is new, and it provides under certain circumstances for the payment of allowances to mothers of children born out of wedlock.

Section number 3 is also new, and it allows for payment to a permanently unemployable father, where the mother is dead or has been absent from home for at least 6 months, thus eliminating the necessity of a foster mother being in the home before the allowance can be paid under those circumstances.

### THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

Hon. G. H. Dunbar moves first reading of Bill No. 75 intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: In 1948, there was an amendment to The Public Service Act, whereby casual labourers would not be permitted to qualify for superannuation except from the time they became permanent employees. The present legislation repeals that amendment of 1948.

A casual labourer, when made a permanent employee, if he desires, may pay back any required number of years, and the government will contribute dollar for dollar towards his superannuation.

### THE MARRIAGE ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunbar moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: The purpose of this amendment is to make it possible, now that the marriages of Indians have to be registered as a matter of Vital Statistics, that they may be married by persons named by the chief on their reserve, or

in any unorganized territory. It is provided there shall be no fee charged for such a marriage.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Does that apply to honorary chiefs too?

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome to this Assembly this afternoon, 3 groups from 3 different sections of Ontario, a group of pupils from Forest Hill school, a group from Howard Park school, and a group of 40 women from the City of Hamilton.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Retirement Fund for the year ended March 31, 1955.

2. Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1955.

3. Report of the Commissioner of Agricultural Loans for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

4. Financial statement of The Settlers' Loan Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

5. Copy of Order-in-Council No. OC75155 under The Northern Development Act.

6. Report of The Committee of Enquiry into the Economics of the Gold-Mining Industry, 1955.

Orders of the day.

#### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY TO SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make some remarks in this debate on the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I should say at once that I do not intend to develop all the subjects which one might discuss in relation to this particular motion. There will be ample opportunity in subsequent days to

take up those matters which time does not permit me an opportunity to discuss today. I hope and expect also that other hon. members of the Opposition will take up the questions which I do not discuss this afternoon.

I want to discuss a number of questions which I believe are pertinent and have a wide range of interest in this province at the present time. Most of them have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, although there are some notable exceptions with respect to particular subjects to which I will draw attention as I move along.

Custom demands, and I hasten to comply, with the pattern of complimenting the mover (Mr. Maloney) and the seconder (Mr. Lyons) of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

So far as the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) is concerned, I look forward to his contribution every year. Each year it seems to grow, in his mind at least, and the pile of books under the manuscript gets taller as one year passes into another.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the subject matter of the hon. member's remarks has all but escaped me. I do not blame the hon. member, but rather on the fact that I am slow to remember, and cannot retain what I hear for any great length of time.

I do recall however the hon. member coming to an important passage in his speech, and I cannot help but comment on that particular portion of his remarks. I refer to the point at which he sought to eulogize the hon. Prime Minister. A eulogy more profuse and more prolonged than any I have ever heard. I have read a good many such compositions. Usually, they are about men who have rendered whatever service they felt called upon to do, and have passed to whatever reward awaits them. But the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie eulogized one who is, to us at least, a mortal amongst us.

As I listened to the words that fell in torrents from the lips of the hon. member, I wondered if all that searching and reaching and yearning for the day when

we would realize that we had found the perfect man, had finally borne fruit. I hope that day has not arrived, because it seems to me that if it has arrived, and if the long-awaited person were in our midst, then most of us would cease struggling, because to attain an equal role would not seem really worthwhile. Therefore, I hope the hon. member did not intend to convey to the House the suggestion that we had arrived at the great time when we need not struggle more and need not raise our sights to fire at better things.

It may well be that there were better matters discussed by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie which I should have remembered, but really that particular passage was the one which remained with me and which I thought I should recall to the minds of the hon. members this afternoon.

The hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney)—and I have to watch any reference which I make to him and be sure to temper it, because of the fact that he sits at what is for me an awkward angle, and I would not be able to discern readily just what counter-measures he was about to adopt—the hon. member read his remarks exceptionally well. I doubt very much if he needed to read them, and I hope we will have the benefit of his ability in the House expressed in his own words, and without a written manuscript in front of him.

There are 2 or 3 references I wish to make on the speech from the hon. member for Renfrew South. On page 32 of *Hansard*, he is quoted as saying—and as he reached this part of his speech, I seemed to detect that he himself felt that this was the high mark of his achievement, and if he accomplishes nothing else in his political career, it would still have been worthwhile:

Our county has been signally honoured in having the first highway designated in recent years as a Queen's Highway in this province, and I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first road taken over by the province, since 1943, and designated as a Queen's Highway.

And I could hear the hon. member as he made those remarks, and I almost sensed the feeling of pride with which he told this House that the famous Dacre road was now a Queen's Highway. May I say in that regard that I am glad that something moved this government to abandon their previously held position in regard to the acquisition of county roads into the Provincial Highways System. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that it took a by-election to make them take this plunge and to divert them from their action, or lack of action, over the years.

I am suggesting to the House that the government has abandoned the position they have held to tenaciously since 1943, and that from now on we can expect more and more county roads will be taken into the Provincial Roads System. I refuse to believe, for the moment at least, that the fact that there was a by-election in South Renfrew had anything to do with the designating of this road as a "provincial highway." I am perhaps too green in this political business, but I cannot go along with anyone who suggests that there was a coincidence between the designation of this road and the fact that a by-election was being carried on.

Of course, if I wanted to be more seasoned in my remarks on this particular question, I could remember that in the Quebec Legislature just a few short weeks ago, the hon. Prime Minister of that province, as reported in the press, replied thus to a Liberal member who wanted a bridge across a river, the name of which at the moment escapes me, although I have not forgotten the retort of the hon. Prime Minister of Quebec, who said:

As long as this riding continues to elect a Liberal member, you will not get a bridge.

You can swim it, jump it or stay on your own side, so long as you continue to elect the Liberal member, you will not get your bridge across the Shawinigan River.

I just want to say in passing that we do not do things like that in such



a brutal way. This government does precisely the same thing, but with greater finesse. They are much more subtle in the aiming of their political propaganda.

Can anyone imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, the present hon. Prime Minister rising in his place and saying, "You can not have a bridge in South Grey as long as the hon. Leader of the Opposition is your member"? That is not the way this government does things, and it just goes to point out that there is more than one way of choking a cat than doing it with butter. You can do it in 2 or 3 different ways. Quebec does it one way, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of Ontario does it in another way. The goal is the same, and the attaining of that goal, I would say, is almost as easily achieved by the method employed by this government as the method employed by the government of the Province of Quebec.

In Ontario, we do not say: "You cannot have a bridge unless you vote for our Party." What we say—or at least what the present government says—is: "We are going to give you a bridge," or a road, or a school, or a hospital, or whatever it turns out to be—and may I point out that there were all those things in South Renfrew—"We are going to see that you are generously dealt with in respect to these projects, and we have sufficient faith in human nature that you will do your duty as you see it, after these things have been dangled before you"; they will have attained the same result as the Prime Minister of Quebec obtains by his frontal attack. As I say, the end to be achieved is the same, the methods are different.

If that is not enough, the government tells the people, as the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney) said the other day, that back in 1943 the Liberal government of that day was so miserable in their grants, they allowed such a small amount for education, that you could hardly see what they gave for hospitals and roads.

May I suggest to the hon. member and to those whose main contribution

in this House is to say, "Yes, yes," and to clap when the government thinks they should clap, that they should go back to the days of the Conservative government, back before 1934, and they will find there was just as great a difference between the grants that were given prior to 1934 and those which were given after 1934. In other words, you pay out grants from the provincial government from the monies you receive in taxation from the people, and if those taxes bring in more this year than they did the year before, then it does not take much of a mathematician to be able to point out that: "We can pay out more this year than we did the year before."

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is a very foolish argument for the government to use, because, as I say, it has been the progression down through the years, in the days of the Henry government prior to 1934, the grants for education and for hospitals and such things were much less than they were under the Liberal government which followed the 1934 election, just as the ones between 1934 and 1943 were less than the ones being paid by the present government. That is a natural evolution, and my friends are very careless when they suggest there is anything to be gained politically by an argument which has as its basis the disparity in grants down through the years. I suggest to the House that we have just about reached the place where we can well abandon that sort of argument.

We are collecting in taxes in this province 4 or 5 times what we collected in 1934—6 times, the hon. member for Brant says. There is not an hon. member of the House who would suggest that the grants to the municipalities should be on a par with those paid in 1943. When you are collecting 6 times the revenue that you did 12 years ago, it follows as naturally as day follows night, that you have it within your power to pay to the municipalities many times the grants which were paid in 1943.

So I say to the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney) and to other hon. members of the House, let us

appreciate the fact that the taxes of the people in this province are accruing year by year, and out of those taxes the government of the province, acting as the agent, pays back to the municipalities a certain portion of the taxes. To me it is a shallow argument to say that we paid more for schools this year than we did 5 or 6 years ago. The only reason you can pay more is because you collect more, and if the people are willing to subject themselves to increased taxes, there is very little limit to where you can go in giving grants to our municipalities and for particular services within those municipalities.

May I deal now for a moment with one more remark made by the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney), and then I am through with his speech, except that I once again extend the invitation to the hon. member to speak often in the House, because we are all quite aware—and I am very frank in this—of the ability he possesses. I know that he can make a great contribution to the work of this Legislature, and I hope he employs himself in that direction, as I feel sure he will.

Somewhere in the hon. member's remarks he said something about the Trans-Canada Highway, and I thought I might just look that up for a moment. On page 33 of *Hansard*, he said:

The Trans-Canada Highway, Mr. Speaker, runs through South Renfrew for a distance of approximately 30 miles, and it is expected that once the Federal Government really decides to get behind this project, our Highway No. 17 will be improved very substantially.

I want to say to the House—and the hon. Prime Minister can correct me when he speaks if I am wrong—that this is the first time I ever heard it being suggested from a reliable source that there was any holding back on the part of the Federal Government in the building of the Trans-Canada Highway.

I have always understood that the Federal Government were not only willing, but anxious, to move with dispatch

in seeing that there was a highway running right across this country of ours, and I know of no time where they said they were not willing to participate to the full with any of the provinces of Canada in speeding this project on its way, and it struck me, therefore, as being a little strange to hear that in this one instance the Federal Government was reluctant to deal with the problem of the Trans-Canada Highway.

I want the hon. Prime Minister, when he speaks this afternoon, if he will be so kind, to tell this House if there has been any hesitancy on the part of the Federal Government to fully participate with the provinces, especially the Province of Ontario, in the building of the Trans-Canada Highway.

I would say in relation to the Trans-Canada Highway, that there has been a slowness on the part of this government in getting on with the job of building the Trans-Canada Highway, and if there is not a speeded-up effort on the part of this Administration, many years will go by before Ontario will have completed its share of the Trans-Canada Highway.

I notice from a document which I have in my hand that there are still 631 miles of unpaved road to be built as Ontario's share of the Trans-Canada Highway. There is a great deal to be done, but very little is being done to bring this road to a realization, and to speed the day when across Canada—or across Ontario, at least—from one side to the other, you can travel on the Trans-Canada Highway. There are 631 miles still to be built. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the fault lies with the Federal Government.

Of course, mind you, if I thought any fault did lie with the Federal Government I would be quick to assess it, and I am sure the House appreciates that. But where I find they are in the right, and doing all that can reasonably be expected of them, then I think I should say so, and should present their points of view before this Legislature.

There is one more point I want to make with respect to the Trans-Canada Highway. I feel very earnestly about this, Mr. Speaker, because I have felt

for years, quite frankly, that this government is just toying with the problem of the Trans-Canada Highway; that they are just building it on a hit-and-miss plan, a little bit here, a little bit there, and not too much anywhere; and I feel the time has come in Ontario when we should earnestly attack this problem of completing our responsibilities in connection with the Trans-Canada Highway as it affects the Province of Ontario.

Mention has been made of the Federal Government being reluctant to help the province in this matter. At the last conference which was held—and I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways will appreciate this—the Federal Government expressed some anxiety about the slowness with which the Trans-Canada Highway was being built, and even went so far as to say that in order to speed the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway, the Federal Government is prepared to pay 90 per cent. of the 10 per cent. of the remaining mileage in order to accelerate the work, and get it done.

It seems to me that is a mighty contribution on the part of the Federal Government. In the case of the Province of Ontario, it would mean over 60 miles which could be built with the co-operation of the Federal Government, with the Federal Government paying 90 per cent. of the cost.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, if there is any blame to be attached to any one for the slowness in the completion of this road, that blame belongs on the government of this province, and this House should demand that the government get on with the job and build this highway in the shortest possible time. They have been at it long enough now to have completed it, and if the slowness of the department continues, it will still be many years before it is completed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want for a few moments to deal with the Speech from the Throne itself. This Speech from the Throne is a remarkable document, not so much for what it says, but rather for what it fails to say. The things which seem to be quite important it says the

least about. A Speech from the Throne is supposed to be a forecast of government legislation. If anybody can tell from this Speech from the Throne what we are likely to expect by way of legislation, he must, indeed, be a top-ranking Philadelphia lawyer because, after all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne is a masterpiece of saying nothing. It is well worded; no question about that. But the meat in the Speech from the Throne is not there, except as to what may be guessed at in regard to its contents.

I want to deal for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, with some of the things which do not appear in the Speech from the Throne this year. One of these has to do with the great problem of agriculture. This government in the past has been very anxious to claim credit for the prosperity which has been prevalent in the agricultural industry. I remember even last year the hon. Prime Minister—who was then acting in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer—made note of it in his Budget speech, and he called upon all to witness that even though agriculture was suffering in other parts of Canada, Ontario had held its head above water, and its farmers were doing better than in any other part of Canada.

Of course, that was in a pre-election year; it was in a year when he wanted to secure all the credit he could for the then prosperity of the agricultural industry.

Well, if the government is going to take credit for the prosperity, it must take some of the responsibility when there is a lack of prosperity. So far as agriculture in this province is concerned today, there is a lack—and a very definite lack—of prosperity amongst our farm people, and this presents a challenge to this Legislature and to the government to do what it can to stem what appears to be a tide toward the devastatingly low prices for agricultural products in this province.

The Federation of Agriculture and the Farmers' Union have both presented briefs to the government in which they called upon this administration to play



its full part in alleviating, as far as possible, the difficulties in which the farmers find themselves at the moment.

I want to speak about this problem for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, because, to me, any depression in the farming industry is a bad sign on our economic horizon. It has been proven I think enough times that if there is a lack of prosperity in farming, that lack of prosperity will ultimately be reflected in the other branches of the economic life of this province and of this country. So one is not being selfish when suggesting anything which can be done to better the position of the agricultural people, because it will likewise be reflected in the strengthening of the economic fabric of this province and this country as a whole.

I am quite conversant with the suggestion that many of the things which could be done to help agriculture are federal in character, and I will be the first one to admit that. But I say, at the same time, there are things this government could be doing which they are not doing, and a share of responsibility falls, therefore, on the shoulders of this administration.

I would like to give one example of what I mean. In the first place, I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if The Department of Agriculture, as such, is serving the farm people of this province in the best possible way. The Department of Agriculture was set up many years ago when the problem as it affected farmers was one of production, when the things the farmers wanted to do were to grow two blades of grass where one grew before, and to make two pounds of butter, where one was made before. The Department of Agriculture was set up in those days and in that atmosphere, and I suggest to this House it has retained altogether too much of that atmosphere in the conditions under which we are living today.

Our problem in this province, agriculturally speaking, is no longer one of production; we have solved that problem. The problem today is the marketing of those products we produce so

efficiently in this province, and I say to the hon. Prime Minister, and to this House, that in meeting that problem, The Department of Agriculture has fallen far short of what the people of this province have the right to expect. I suggest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there should be set up in this province a Department of Marketing, which should have full control and supervision over the vast network of marketing problems in Ontario. I do not think we are going to get the leadership this problem requires from the present set-up of The Department of Agriculture.

And I want to say further that, as a farmer, I am alarmed at the conditions under which farmers are operating today in so far as The Farm Products Marketing Act is concerned. This Marketing Act was brought in a number of years ago. There have been many commodity groups organized in the province under the provisions of The Farm Marketing Act.

Now, to make a long story short, it is suggested in the Speech from the Throne that there is some doubt as to the constitutional standing of some of these various Marketing Act commodity groups, and because of this, the government of this province has referred the latter to a federal court for a decision as to its validity or otherwise. I want to suggest to the government it has been extremely lax in this whole matter, although "lax" is not a word which is strong enough to express the position the government takes in relation to this whole marketing problem.

In the Speech from the Throne itself—I do not know who wrote the Speech from the Throne; perhaps the hon. member for Lanark had something to do with it, as he is otherwise not too much employed at the moment—but whoever wrote the Speech from the Throne, with particular reference to this marketing legislation, made what I thought was a slip, and the hon. Prime Minister could well have his writers before him in regard to that so-called slip.

The slip was this, in my judgment: the Speech from the Throne goes on to

say there is some doubt as to the validity of these Acts, and it says further, "We have for a number of years known of these doubts"—"for a number of years." In other words, the Government of Ontario for a number of years has questioned, or has had reason to question, the validity of this marketing legislation. For a number of years they have known, according to their own statement, that something was wrong, and now at a time when farmers' incomes are as low or lower than they have been for many years, when the benefits which would flow from these commodity marketing groups would be of the greatest possible value, this is the time the government takes to refer these matters to the courts—at the lowest ebb of income, so far as the farmers are concerned, and at a time when it will cause the maximum disruption in the marketing organization. That is the time when the government throws the whole matter into the courts.

They say, at the same time, this is not new to them; they have known there was something wrong with this Act; they have known it, and have said in an official document that for some years the whole thing was full of crevices and loopholes. If they knew it then, why did they not fix them years ago? When they knew it 10 years ago, and thought it should be referred to the courts for clarification, why did they not refer this matter to the courts then, instead of going on and on, living in a house of dreams, so to speak, living in a fantasy, as far as legislation was concerned?

I think the House will recall we have had a Milk Control Act in this province for 25 years or more. I want to say to those who do not live on the farms, that it is sometimes suggested The Milk Control Act should be abolished, but I want to say now, once and for all, that I have always felt that The Milk Control Act rendered a great service, not only to the farm people but to the people who live everywhere in this Province of Ontario.

Under The Milk Control Act, the Milk Control Board would assess the picture in a certain locality, and if there

was an application for another distributor, then the Board would have the authority to say whether or not, in their judgment, another distributor was necessary. If they felt the people were being well served, and that the distribution service was adequate, then they were in a position under the Act not only to suggest, but to say that in their opinion the field was being well served, and there was no need for an additional outlet.

On down through the years, these decisions have been made without question. A few months ago somebody had the temerity to question the legality and validity of this Act in the courts, and when he tested it, he found there were great weaknesses in the Act and, as I recall the judgment in that particular case, it simply means that all that has been done through the years under The Milk Control Act goes out the window, and any man can start a dairy anywhere in this province, and the Milk Control Board has no authority to tell him "no".

The only way the government has been able to thwart those who want to start a dairy, is to refer these matters to the courts for interpretation, and I suggest most seriously this afternoon that the government of this province has failed the people in Ontario in regard to the farm marketing legislation.

I want to make one more point in this connection. I believe the government of this province has failed in what, to me, is a governmental duty, and that duty is to portray the conditions of the agricultural industry to the people of Ontario, generally. You do not hear a "peep" out of the government of this province, or The Department of Agriculture, as to the farmers' position. You do not hear any explanation for that. You do not hear anybody trying to "sell" the people who are the consumers, and who live in the cities, with the idea that a supporting price for agricultural products is not only good for the farmers but good for the city dwellers as well.

I have seen nothing from our Department of Agriculture which would suggest whether or not they are in favour

of the shipment, within the last few months, of butter to a foreign country at a much lower price. It seems to me that the government of this province has fallen far short of what we have a right to expect of it in the matter of public relations as far as the agricultural industry is concerned.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, most earnestly that the people who live in the cities and are concerned with these problems should be informed as to their relative values. I believe they should be told why it is advantageous for us in Canada to ship butter overseas at a lower price than that at which it is being sold to the people in Canada. I believe they should be informed of these matters, and when they are informed, we can go forward in a united effort to deal adequately and fully with that problem of the agricultural industry. What I am bound to say—

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition how he feels about the present price of butter?

MR. OLIVER: I am glad the hon. member for Hamilton asked that question, Mr. Speaker. That is the first speech from Hamilton, as far as I know, and some one should record the fact that the voice of Hamilton was raised in this House on a very important matter.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): A voice was raised a few days ago by another hon. member from Hamilton. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition was not listening.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister may think I am not listening, but I have "got it" all. However, I am sure the hon. member asked a serious question, and I do not mind speaking on it for a moment or so. I am rather inclined to tell the hon. member for Hamilton to take the hon. Prime Minister into the quiet solitude of his hotel room, or the home of the member, and I am sure he will be given precisely the same answer. We sold the butter at 37 cents—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. leader of the Opposition says "we" I assume he means the Federal Government.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister is quick on these things. Really he is sharp this afternoon.

This butter was sold overseas at 37 cents a pound, and I, for one, believe it is far better to get rid of some of this surplus butter, even though it brings a lower price, than it is to hold it in Canada, where it would only become an additional surplus here.

But the question naturally arises, if you have the 58 cent floor on butter, why sell it anywhere else for 37 cents? The moment you try to sell butter in Canada for 37 cents, you take the floor away completely from the 58 cents supporting price. I do not think the hon. members want to do that. I think they follow very well what the Federal Government is doing in this regard.

But I would add this rider. I think there is a very definite limit beyond which you cannot go, either in selling at a low price, or in giving your product away. I think if you go beyond that very well-defined limit, you disorganize the agricultural conditions in this country, with respect to butter or any other product, and in the long run, as long as it is done in a well-recognized manner, I believe it will resolve itself into a better and more solidified market.

I want to talk for a little while about something not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I will get back to the Speech from the Throne itself before long. Did the hon. Provincial Treasurer say something?

HON. DANA PORTER: I did not say anything. I was just laughing.

HON. MR. FROST: We are just "flabbergasted." That is all. You found that butter too slippery.

MR. OLIVER: I imagined the way I handled it would meet with your approval, but if it does not I will be glad to hear you say so. I want to discuss



for a little while another matter that did not find its way into the Speech from the Throne. It deals with the problem of labour in Ontario.

I do not want to deal extensively with this problem, but I want to put a proposition before the government which, in my opinion, merits at least some attention.

We have had in Ontario during the last year a very serious and prolonged dislocation so far as employment is concerned. I think all of us, irrespective of Party, would be anxious to effect a remedy, if one is possible of attainment.

What I want to say to the government this afternoon is that I believe the time has come in this Legislature when we should call the Labour Committee together as a unit of government in the province.

I am quite well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the reasons, either real or fancied—and I am not going to argue which they were—why the committee was not called previously. If the reasons were as I construe them to be, then they really do not exist at the present time.

I would earnestly suggest to the government, yea, I would demand of them, that they convene the Labour Committee during this session of the Legislature and that they ask the labour organizations of this province to present their views before the members of that committee.

We should ask them specifically if there are changes they feel should be made in our labour legislation, which would enhance the industrial peace of this province. I want to know, as an individual member, if these great unions have changes in mind which, in their judgment, would be beneficial. Perhaps they would not meet with the approval of all of us but from their presentation, it seem to me, we would gain nothing but good, and it might be that we would be able to plug the holes in the labour legislation of the province.

I would like the committee members to have full opportunity to examine The Labour Relations Act and all other Acts in The Labour Department, with a view

to making them into the most up-to-date labour laws this province has ever known.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is a reasonable request, and there cannot be any logical reason why that Labour Committee should not meet.

In this day and age, when there is, as I say, such a dislocation in the employment and in the earning power of our people, when there are so many problems between management and labour, we would be doing less than our duty, I suggest, if we did not insist that the Labour Committee meet and make a complete and a searching analysis of all that has to do with the machinery of arbitration and conciliation and all the other things that go to make up The Department of Labour. I earnestly suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that, speaking this afternoon, he deal with that matter, because to me it is rather fundamental.

I want to talk for a few minutes about another matter, that is, municipal affairs. I am sorry the hon. Minister has gone out. I always like talking when the hon. Minister is here. You are pretty sure that he is not going to agree with you, but when he is in front of you, you know that at the time, and that is always helpful—or one may call it “helpful.”

In regard to municipal affairs, I am not going to argue this afternoon that the municipalities should get more money from the province. I have said that often enough in this House, so often that even the hon. Prime Minister should be aware that there is a problem there and he has not met it. He is moving ever towards it, but ever so slowly, and at the present rate of progress we will have turned another century before he discharges his proper obligation.

HON. MR. FROST: Do you expect me to be here then?

MR. OLIVER: There is another matter, in regard to municipal taxes, with which I want to deal, and I want to deal with it at some length, because I think it is important. We pressed in this House for many years to have a

committee set up to deal with the problem of municipal-provincial relations. Finally, I think it was in the year 1951, the hon. Prime Minister moved for such a committee. It was the "Cheater Commission"—rather, the Chater Committee, though it might be more accurately and properly known by the first name.

I wish those who are newly-elected members of this House could have heard the hon. Prime Minister in those days. What this committee was not going to do for the municipalities and for the relationship between them and the province was nobody's business. They were going to solve all the unsolved problems and bring peace where chaos reigned. Great things were held out for this committee and it started on its journey. I think the hon. member for West York was on it. Perhaps he was never very fond of the committee, but he was going along, anyway for the time being.

This committee had a number of meetings, so one day we asked the hon. Prime Minister if there was any chance of getting a report from this committee, that had been out so long, wandering about, trying to find answers to certain specific questions.

Finally, there was filed what was called an "interim report." I called that a "squib" and the hon. Prime Minister was angry about it. It was really a "squib," and nothing else.

This report made a famous declaration. It said that the municipal taxpayers could not bear any more by way of real estate taxes. Well, what a mighty pronouncement! There is not a man in this House but knew that real estate was bearing all it could bear by way of taxation.

After ponderous study this committee came up with the pronouncement, which was carried in headlines across the province: "Real Estate Cannot Bear Any More Taxes."

Then they made a second pronouncement. They had to justify their first one, and so they said that if it could not bear any more taxes, then the thing to do was to inaugurate a system of

unconditional grants. They spoke of unconditional grants as if they had just picked that idea out of their minds, as if no one had heard of them, as if it were something new that the committee had fashioned from their own search for the truth in these matters.

Why, years before that, I had demanded of this government that they give the municipalities unconditional grants. I remember quite well the hon. Prime Minister telling us how unconditional grants were given in some of the States of the Union. So this committee comes in, on the heels of this argument, and says that what we should do is give the municipalities unconditional grants.

Having divested themselves of that great responsibility, and having come forth with this great pronouncement, they folded up and were about to die, when the hon. Prime Minister rushed to their rescue and by an Act of this Legislature made it a permanent committee. That is the only thing that saved it from dying an unnatural death.

All was quiet on the committee front for a little while, until the new Minister of Municipal Affairs assumed office, then, lo and behold, the other day we heard the announcement that there is to be another committee. Lo—another committee—yet another—to do the same things that the others were supposed to have done, and taking the same form as the others had taken!

I want to say to this House as emphatically as I can that I am absolutely opposed, not to the personnel of this new committee, but to the form of it. The form of this committee is identical with those which have gone before, and which were useless in this province and which will simply be a repetition of what has happened in connection with these committees.

This committee was appointed by the government, not by the Legislature, and it will report to the government, not to the Legislature. In spite of the hon. member from York West and any other well-intentioned person who is on that committee, this committee will do as

the government wants it to do; it will go where the government wants it to go; and it will report the things the government wants it to report. I suggest that the Act setting up that committee in that form is not worth the paper it is written on, and the sooner it is disbanded the better.

I am going to suggest to this House that a real committee would be one of all Parties in the Legislature, appointed by the Legislature and which is to report back to the Legislature. It could take the place of this committee, that is doomed before it starts to work. I suggest as strongly as I can that this one cannot succeed where similar ones have failed. They are built on false premises, the foundation is not right, and you cannot build an edifice which will yield lasting good to this province if you are going to build it upon a committee which emanates solely from the government and which has the government purposes in mind, whether they know it or not. I suggest that will be the situation in regard to this committee.

I want to speak for a moment or so on yet another matter, the matter of reform institutions. Inasmuch as there has been considerable discussion about reform institutions, I want to make some remarks on that subject this afternoon.

It goes back to 3 years ago, when, as the House will recall, the hon. member for Brant moved in the House that a select committee be appointed to investigate The Department of Reform Institutions. The reason he gave for his motion at that time was to me a very sound one, and I think it appeared sound to other members of the House. He said, as I recall it, that there had not been a similar examination by a Parliamentary committee for a great many years. Secondly, he felt that, inasmuch as this department was dealing with the lives of a great many people, it would be well to see, by a thorough examination, if all was being done that could and should be done with respect to reform institutions.

That committee was set up, with the hon. member for Parkdale as chairman.

My colleague, the hon. member for Stormont and myself, represented our Party on that committee. This committee made a thorough investigation, I would say, of reform institutions. It came up with a voluminous report, containing well over 100 recommendations. Most of them have never been implemented by the government of this province.

Committees of this kind lose 90 per cent. of their value if the government to which they present their reports does not implement the recommendations of the committees. That is what happened with respect to reform institutions and it is what is happening to too many reports from various committees.

It seems to me that after much money and much time has been spent by committee members, the government should honour the committee's work by implementing in large measure at least, the reforms which have been suggested.

I want to deal for just a few moments with 2 or 3 things the committee recommended. They recommended, first of all—and I think it is the most important recommendation—that a full-scale reception centre be established, to receive, study, diagnose and recommend treatment for all first offenders between the ages of 16 and 25, male and female, sentenced to provincial institutions. That has never been done and I believe that there is a crying need for the implementation of that particular recommendation.

HON. MR. FOOTE: There was something done about it—a year ago, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: I say it has not been implemented in full.

MR. MacDONALD: A very small proportion, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, what does the hon. member know about it?

MR. OLIVER: The hon. members should not hold a conversation now. The committee felt—and possibly with



justification—that if reform is to mean anything in this province, the first thing to do is separate the reformable material from those who cannot be reformed.

If you put the ones who are capable of being reformed in with a man who has been in 8 or 10 times and is a confirmed offender, then what you are doing, of course, is putting the whole group in the position where they cannot be reformed.

HON. MR. FOOTE: We do not do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: Therefore, the committee recommended that a full-scale reception centre be established, and in my opinion that is an important thing when one is considering these matters.

There has been a good deal of discussion in regard to the question of sex deviates, and I would like to deal with that as briefly as I can, because the committee over two years ago recommended to the government that they do the things which they now believe they will start to do.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Mr. Speaker, we have already done them.

MR. OLIVER: The other day when all this publicity was being given to sex crimes, the papers reported that 3 hon. Ministers were closeted for long hours, seeking to find a solution to this problem, seeking to find a way out, and it was suggested that at the end of the conference, in the evening, when these men, tired and haggard, came out of their conference, it was announced they had arrived at two conclusions. One was that those who were sentenced for such crimes should be sentenced to an indeterminate term, and the other was that they be segregated and put in a place where they could be treated. That is what the papers carried as an indication of what the government intended to do when the crisis was upon them.

I suggest to this House this afternoon that almost 3 years ago the Committee on Reform Institutions recommended you do that if you wanted to avert a storm in this province.

The trouble with this government, Mr. Speaker, is that it never thinks to do the right thing until the crisis is upon them, and then they get themselves all “worked up,” and consequently do a bad job on the whole matter. I suggest to the government and to the hon. Minister, for whom I have a very high regard, that those recommendations should have been put into effect long ago. They should not have been left until the present time, because, if they had been in effect for 2 or 3 years, beneficial results would have been manifested by this time.

So I say to the House this afternoon that whatever discussions we have had in respect to reform institutions, we would do well to recall that most of the matters under discussion were dealt with in a fairly adequate way by the committee which sat for a long time on these matters.

I want now to deal, Mr. Speaker, with one more matter and then I am through. That matter has to do with what is commonly known as “health insurance” or “hospitalization insurance.”

This is not a new subject in this province; it has been suggested for a long time. It has been advocated, I am frank to say, by federal and provincial Parties for many years. I believe most Parties have a conviction, deep down somewhere at least, that health and hospital insurance is not only desirable, but necessary if we are going to keep pace with the times.

To bring the whole subject up to date, I want to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Party have many times suggested to the government that it should embark on a health insurance scheme. Even as late as last year the hon. Prime Minister of the province, in a detailed speech on this matter, suggested we could not do it because of the cost, on the one hand, and because there were not sufficient hospital beds, on the other.

At the present time, the situation is well known to everyone. The Federal Government has announced a policy in regard to hospitalization insurance.

There are those who say that the Provincial Government had a hand in forcing them into that position.

I am glad to hear that endorsement, because I shall have something pertinent to say about that in a moment or so.

There are those who say that the Provincial Government's proposal—and, by the way, they were called "proposals" in the Speech from the Throne; I never knew the government actually made proposals on behalf of the province until I read it in the Speech from the Throne. Will the hon. Prime Minister tell us this afternoon, are there definite, actual, Provincial Government proposals in regard to hospitalization insurance? Because, if there are, we should know about them.

The Federal Government, through the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada made an important announcement on this subject last fall. He said at that time that he recognized health and all that went with it, belonged to the provinces, was under provincial jurisdiction, and that the Federal Government could not, therefore, initiate and administer a health insurance policy or plan, because it would be running foul of the British North America Act. In other words, it would have to amend the Constitution and obtain the consent, I believe, of each individual province across Canada.

I am not suggesting that was an insurmountable task; I am simply saying that the declaration of the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada suggested that health was a provincial responsibility, and he said he was prepared to make this announcement, that if the majority of the provinces of Canada, representing the majority of the people of Canada, expressed a desire for health insurance, the Federal Government would put itself in the position of contributing to that provincial scheme.

That is where the matter stands at the moment, except as to the position of this province in relation to the whole matter. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the government of the Province of Ontario holds in its hands today the question of whether or not we have a national insurance hospitalization

scheme. It has the answer; it holds the key, and it seems to me that in this session of the Legislature, we should have before us the concrete plans, if any, of this province in relation to this matter.

That brings me to this point: in the Speech from the Throne itself, we had the announcement that the proposals of the Federal Government and those of the Provincial Government would be placed before the Standing Committee on Health, and would be examined and reported upon to the House.

Where, Mr. Speaker, has responsible government gone to in this province? What kind of a way is that for any government to act? If the government was "calling the bluff" of somebody else, who is "calling the bluff" now?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker—

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister will have his chance.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that just a moment ago, he was telling us what he wanted done about labour, that in his opinion the matter should be referred to the Committee on Labour; what about that?

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister knows quite well that this is a most unusual way to handle an important subject. He knows quite well if this government is in favour of a hospitalization insurance scheme and wishes to go into partnership with the Federal Government, the thing for it to have done was to have brought his proposed legislation down in this House and let us see what it is.

After that, if he wants to refer it to a committee, alright. Has he lost all sense of responsible government? Why is it, unless it is a delaying action, unless the hon. Prime Minister is holding a watching brief? Who is "calling the bluff" now? Why does not the hon. Prime Minister act, if he is so much in earnest about hospitalization insurance? Why does he not move in the next few days to place before this Legislature the

government's plan, if it has any, to implement hospitalization insurance in this province?

What kind of a way is it to govern, to send such an important proposal to the committee, before the legislators have ever seen what colour it is? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that in this matter we have fallen far from what we have a right to expect from those who call themselves "statesmen" in this province, and I suggest most earnestly that if we are in favour of health and hospital insurance, let us say so. If we are in favour of going in with the Federal Government, let us say so. And if we want to be prepared to do that, let us bring our proposed legislation into the House and work on it here, and fashion out of it the best sort of financial agreement for the province. The way it is being done now—and I want to repeat this—cannot be construed in any way but that this is a delaying action.

The hon. Prime Minister was so ready a few weeks ago when he thought he had the Federal Government "on the spot." Now the shoe is on the other foot, and it is the hon. Prime Minister who is not ready, the hon. Prime Minister who is afraid to move too fast.

MR. G. F. LAVERGNE (Russell) : But he moves in the right direction, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is the hon. member from Eastview. We have not heard from him before in this session. May I inquire, how are things down east?

MR. LAVERGNE: The hon. leader of the Opposition will hear from me shortly.

MR. OLIVER: I do say to the House that to me the most amazing part of the Speech from the Throne was that innocuous section which dealt with the important matter of hospitalization insurance. I have never known a responsible government to act so flippantly in regard to a matter they used to hold so close to their hearts. I hope the day will

come shortly when this government will reverse its position in that regard, and let us have the Bill in the House, and let us see where we are going in regard to hospitalization insurance.

I have said a great deal this afternoon, and now I have a motion to make which rather suggests that I am not in favour of a number of things the government has been doing.

I move, therefore, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the Motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"But this House regrets that the government has failed to:

1. Take positive measures to establish a Provincial Hospital Insurance Plan.

2. Give consideration to the many problems that arise under the present municipal legislation whereby all municipalities are hampered in sound administration by obsolete municipal legislation and by excessive provincial supervision in matters on which the responsibilities of the local municipal governments should be recognized.

3. Give adequate assurance of completion of the Trans-Canada Highway within Ontario as early as possible in view of the general benefits that will result to residents of all parts of Ontario.

4. Accept the responsibility of undertaking to formulate and present a sound and constructive policy with respect to farm marketing.

5. Implement the recommendations of the Select Committee on Reform Institutions of 1954.

6. Consummate an agreement with the Federal Government for sharing the costs of unemployment relief.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all at this formal session congratulate you on your election as the Speaker of this House. In so doing I would like to pay tribute as well to the hon. member for Windsor - Walkerville (Mr. Davies)



who for some 7 or 8 sessions graced the Chair as Speaker, and who contributed greatly to the traditions of this House. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the position is in worthy hands and when the time comes for you to leave that exalted post you will also have enhanced the prestige of the Speaker's Chair.

I should like to join with the hon. leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to the mover and seconder of the address, but I shall not do so in such a grumbling manner as he displayed in his reference to those two very fine speeches. I might say that my modesty was somewhat affected by the speech of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) but aside from his particular reference to myself, may I say that he delivered a great speech in this House as did the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney).

Perhaps you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, for making a few personal references here but I would like to say that the hon. member for Renfrew South comes from a family long connected with the political life of this province. His grandfather Bondfield for many years sat in this Legislature and afterwards his father, Dr. Martin Maloney, was a representative of that grand old riding in the federal House. I look back to the days when the hon. member's father was alive to the times when I have met him and his mother; who I am glad to say is still alive, a fine person, and a fine Canadian. It is an addition to the traditions and history of this House that we should have here now a member of a family two of whom have previously served in the Parliaments of our province and our country.

May I say in relation to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie that many of us here will remember his father, the Hon. James Lyons, who sat in this house as a Minister and as a member of this Legislature. Well do I remember occasions upon which I have consulted "Jim" Lyons, as I knew him, and spoken to him in connection with some of the problems of the northern country and of our province generally.

I have a soft spot in my heart for that great old riding of Sault Ste. Marie. My own godfather, Andrew Miscampbell, represented that riding at one time, and I always feel that I have some relationship with the riding of Sault Ste. Marie. I would tell the hon. members opposite that I feel that so strongly, I might even give them some roads in that country.

Today we are having a new view of the 25th Legislature elected last spring; there are changes in some of the seats here and some of the faces. I should like to welcome to this House the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), the leader of the CCF group. In my time here, and in the time of many of the hon. members of this House, we have had associations with that group—I only intend to refer to these associations from a personal standpoint, of course—many of us here were admirers of the former leader of that group, Mr. Joliffe, who represented on two occasions the riding of York South.

I always regarded Mr. Joliffe as a gentleman, an able parliamentarian, one who made a very fine contribution to this House, particularly in matters which were not contentious, but dealt with the general laws and government of this province. Mr. Joliffe left a fine mark on this Assembly and even those of us who were in opposition in other Parties had a good deal of respect and even affection for his ability and his personality. That is also true of the present hon. member's predecessor in that seat last session, the former hon. member for Cochrane South, Mr. Grummett, who in his own way, over many years, made a very fine contribution in the work and debates of this Assembly.

When I welcome here the hon. member for York South as the leader of a group, may I say that we welcome him here as a former resident and native, I believe, of the great old province of British Columbia, one of the outstanding provinces of Canada. We welcome him here as a former member of the "Fourth Estate," the press, because he had some connections with the press in other days,

I believe as a correspondent and representative of one of the great newspapers in Canada. I am sorry he did not follow that great paper's traditions politically but, nevertheless, we are glad to welcome him as one who has been connected with the press which does such a fine job for the people of this province and this country.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, it was that Conservative paper which persuaded me to be a Socialist.

HON. MR. FROST: Is that so? Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear that the hon. member, after being with that paper in Montreal, did not catch some of the great principles and great spirit which have made Ontario and Canada great. However, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to welcome him here as one connected with one of our great Ontario universities, Queen's, because he is a graduate of that institution. Then, I welcome him here as a Scotsman and I say that with all due respect to the hon. member for Ottawa West and the hon. member for Peel and the rest of them. I am glad to welcome him as a Scotsman, because no one with the name of "Donald MacDonald" could be anything else but a Scotsman.

On viewing this new House we welcome the new hon. members and the new leader of the CCF group.

We are here on this occasion taking part in this debate after an election. An election was called last spring, apparently to the full satisfaction of the hon. leader of the Opposition and others. They were glad that an election was called at that time. They expected, I suppose, in a very mild sort of way a result different than the great verdict which the people gave on June 9 for good government in this province. I say this with some gratification, and with a good deal of humility, because I know the duties and the obligations that the election of a following of 84 hon. members of the government out of a House of 98 involves. This great endorsement gives a sense of gratification and satisfaction to the government, a govern-

ment which I can assure you has endeavoured to do its very best for the people. Faced with great problems as we are, we must plot a course in a sea of problems which in these days of great development has been pretty well uncharted. It is an overwhelming endorsement.

I was very much impressed with the by-election in Renfrew South last month when the CCF people who had voted for their own candidate in June last, must very obviously have turned around and voted for the government candidate.

MR. OLIVER: What is so surprising about that?

HON. MR. FROST: What is so surprising about that? Why, it means that our great Party has something to offer all good citizens of this province. It is obvious from the results of this election that the people of this province may say, "Well, I would perhaps like to go and vote for this candidate or that candidate," but when there is an alternative, when the opportunity is given, they give their vote to the "Grand Old Party" that has a record unequalled in this province.

I am not alone in that view, Mr. Speaker. I was very much interested in the speech made on the radio by the hon. member for York South in connection with that very matter. I listened to the speech and afterwards I read it with great interest. Time prevents me reading the page that he devoted to this very subject, but I think I can sum it up with the statement that he refers to the fact that when the Liberals have no candidate in the field, instead of voting for the CCF, the opposition voters cast their ballot for the government, for the Progressive Conservative candidate.

MR. MacDONALD: The Liberals do?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, and he also mentioned that when the CCF have not a candidate in the field their voters also vote for the Progressive Conservative candidate.

MR. MacDONALD: I did not say that.

HON. MR. FROST: If you will allow me, I did not intend to read all this but I will.

MR. MacDONALD: It may be the best part of your speech.

HON. MR. FROST: All right, listen:

In 18 ridings the CCF had no candidate so there was a straight fight between the Tories and the Liberals. Yet the Tories won 16 and the Liberals only 2 which is no better than the Liberal average of wins across the province.

For whom do your people vote then? Of course, for the government candidate, and enough voted to elect 16 Conservative candidates out of 18. Now, let me read further:

In two ridings the Liberals ran no candidate—one was in Cochrane South which the veteran CCF member "Bill" Grummett had represented since 1943, the other Temiskaming where the CCF was a strong threat to the Tories. An analysis of the vote in each of these seats shows that the Liberal votes in 1951 split 3 to 1 in favour of the Tory over the CCF.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the supporters of both of those Parties turned in the last resort and voted for the government candidate, "the Tory candidate" as the hon. member likes to call them. Now I will read you the final paragraph:

The overall result of this straight fight proposition was simply this, where the CCF stayed out the "Tories" usually won anyway.

Your own words:

Where the Liberals stayed out the Tories had an even better chance of winning because they got a 3 to 1 split of the Liberal vote.

MR. MacDONALD: Correct, correct.

HON. MR. FROST: Now I can say this afternoon that when I speak to the hon. members opposite I do so not only as the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, but as the leader of the people's Party here in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to let school out at 6 o'clock, so we must move along since I have a lot of things to say to the hon. members opposite.

Concerning the hon. leader of the Opposition's speech, which I listened to with great interest, I must admit that I felt like getting some sand and sanding the road when he began slipping around on that butter business. But I did listen with great interest, and I can only say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that my reference to his speech is just about the same as his comments about the Speech from the Throne, it was remarkable for the things he did not say. I would like to point out just a few of those things that he skipped over this afternoon.

Here, on this 7th day of February, 1956, following another general election in this province, may I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition where were the issues of the great Liberal Party upon which he appealed to the people here last June? Where were those issues? I think it was on May 5, in London, that he got together a group of planks which I referred to previously as "the greatest collection of political driftwood ever put together in one political raft in the history of the province." I think they were 25 of the most ill-considered, uninspiring points, perhaps attempting by force of number alone to follow our 22 points which charted the course of this province after 1943.

Some of those planks or logs which were in the raft were at least 35 years old, they were a collection of logs and planks which remind me of old Sturgeon Lake in Victoria County, where some of the old government's logs have floated around there for the last 75 years until they have become worn and tattered and planed off. That is the type of platform upon which the hon. leader of the Opposition appealed to the people



of this province, and which he now ignores, for he did not refer to it this afternoon at all.

I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that such a raft would not bear his own weight, let alone the weight of the Liberal Party. The truth is that political raft broke up and became no issue at all by May 15 last.

Now I would like to refer to the remaining issue to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred time and time again across this province and about which he did not say one single, solitary word this afternoon. That is in relation to the highway investigation which he called time after time across this province "the highway scandal."

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the hon. Prime Minister means it is still going on?

MR. MacDONALD: Clean it up.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, here is the very one to "clean it up," because I do not dodge these things. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South went all over this province making all sorts of statements, but I am not one who dodges the question in the House. This is the place where these things ought to be discussed.

I view with some seriousness the fact that the leader of a great Party, when his political raft went to pieces, and floated out to sea, and left him swimming around, would resort to this sort of advertising:

WHO GOT YOUR \$28 MILLION?

He was inferring to the people of this province that there was \$28 million of their money stolen or misused. That is what was meant. What about this one:

WAKE UP, ONTARIO.

That is referring to the same thing and includes reams of things that were taken out of context to pull the wool over the people's eyes. May I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition why he did not refer to it here this afternoon?

Perhaps it is due to the fact that on these advertisements here there are the names of 20 of his candidates, every one of whom went down to defeat on June 9.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister should compliment me rather than condemn me for that.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. leader of the Opposition went around the province asking this question, "What became of the \$28 million?" He says it is a lie that no one stole \$28 million; well, how much did they steal, \$27 million? Let him ask this question of the House if this was a matter of importance upon which he appealed to the intelligent electorate of this province, only 8 or 9 months ago. If this was a question of importance then, it is a question of importance now; if it was true then, it is true now; and if it was false then, it is false now; and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the latter is the fact; it was false then and it is false now.

That any one for one moment would say all this to the people that he would appeal to the people of this province last May and June and advertise with statements like this, and then would affront the intelligence of the people of our province by coming here on February 7, 1956, and not saying a single, solitary word about the \$27 million or \$28 million that he inferred was stolen and misused only 8 months ago, is unbelievable.

That is a gauge of the hon. leader of the Opposition's campaign, and he is just repeating what he did last year in making all sorts of statements outside of this House and then coming to this House afterwards and saying not a single, solitary word about these things. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is because of that that he sits over there and we sit over here.

Mr. Speaker, after briefly referring to that particular election issue, I wish to discuss the importance of the highways business which the hon. members realize is a huge business in this province, involving tremendous expenditures, amounting to some \$200 million

per year or more. We have over 600 contractors in this province, and in view of the magnitude of the work involving the letting of some 400 contracts per year, it is not too many contractors to provide for competitive bids for the type of work we have to do.

During the past year, in regard to property alone, there were some 10,400 agreements with individuals that required settlement. Of this number, some 8,940 have been settled, while the remaining 1,460 remain unsettled for various reasons, most of them have arisen in the last 6 months. This creates an executive job which is enormous in itself.

May I point out to the House that at the present time settlements of property claims have virtually arrived at a 90-day basis, which is a great achievement in itself. I would like to repeat that the problem of the executive carrying on of these mighty operations connected with highways and public works is a matter of very, very great and important business for our province.

In regard to the settlement of contractors' claims; this year, since April 1, 277 claims have been settled, and the residue of claims which are not settled on the current basis is becoming a very, very small item indeed. These are reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I think the people of this province vote for this government, give us a vote of confidence, because they realize, feel, and are assured that in the face of the great problems and difficulties, and the dynamic, complex age such as the one through which the province is passing, the government is giving good government to all sections of this province.

I was interested in some reports on the problems of some business concerns. For instance, I see, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the problem of business administration is one in which they have to be always alert, the same as we in this government. In the matter of the new business machines, and developments of that sort, it requires years to bring the system in a great organization such as that, up to date.

In regard to our own service, we have some 20,000 members. Mr. Speaker, it is our desire to develop the executive abilities of the members of our service. I was very much interested in a statement made a short time ago by Dr. L. S. Beattie, of our Department of Education, as reported in the *Financial Post*. It referred to the fact that the supply of industrial leaders is scarce and the demand increasing. It is the duty of industry to ask their great employment centres to bring their employees along, with service training, and give those who are now low in the scale of employment the possibility of executive promotions.

We are doing the same thing in many departments in our service. We plan to institute a programme under The Civil Service Commission to search out and develop potential executives in every department of government. This will be done through a planned system of transfers and promotions, together with regular counselling and rating. In addition, of course, we will continue the constant search we are making to secure good young men and women from the universities and schools to come into the Ontario Civil Service. These are things we are doing and plan to develop further to better and strengthen the administration of government business in these days, when the problems of business, as well as government, are very, very great indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that time is fleeting, and it is now 25 minutes to 6, but there are a few other matters to which I would like to refer.

I would like to turn now to the Speech from the Throne itself. First of all, I have the appraisal by the hon. leader of the Opposition of the Speech from the Throne. He used words which I have heard him repeat in this House, I suppose, on a dozen different occasions, for instance, to the effect that the Speech from the Throne is a "masterpiece in saving nothing," and that it would "take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand it."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about a "Philadelphia lawyer," but I think the people in this province can assess the Speech from the Throne for themselves.

I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition to read, for example, an article in the *Peterborough Examiner*, and see what it had to say about the Speech from the Throne. I will send it over to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and he may read it for himself, and I think he will find it will be very worthwhile reading.

MR. MacDONALD: Is that another Liberal turned Tory?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South should know his politics better than that. He should read articles appearing in *The Toronto Daily Star*, and see what it had to say about the Speech from the Throne. I would also ask him to read the Metropolitan press and include the press across the Province of Ontario. I do not know whether this last paragraph refers to the hon. member or not, but it well might. I would ask him to read the press again in relation to the Speech from the Throne, and the great programme it contained for the advancement and betterment of the people of this province.

It is only a year ago when these same criticisms were heard, at a time when the seat now occupied by the hon. member for York South, was occupied by the then hon. member for Cochrane South, who at that time, said that the Speech from the Throne showed a very workmanlike effort, and one which was well worthy of this House. I do not know whether the present hon. member for York South, after reading some of the editorials, will say something to a similar effect.

In the Speech from the Throne, there is a far-reaching programme for the betterment of the people of our province, in fact, for the betterment of all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, when speaking to this House, of course, my attitude is to take the Ontario view, but I am frank in saying that I also like to take the view that we are all contributing to the welfare and good of all Canada, from British Columbia to the Atlantic Seaboard. Our position in this great province—representing, as it does, one-third

of the population and one-half of the industry and earning power of our country, is really a great part of Canada. We should not refer to the problems of our province as separate from the problems of our country as a whole.

The Speech from the Throne referred to many things; to fiscal relations; the matter of full employment; the matter of farm marketing; the matter of hospital insurance, water supply and pollution, power, natural gas, education, and to a host of other things.

I will not have the opportunity today of dealing with all these things, but I might say a few words to the hon. members opposite concerning the matter of farm marketing.

The hon. leader of the Opposition at times reminds me of Rip Van Winkle, who slept for 20 years, and then awoke to find out what was going on about him. Is the hon. leader of the Opposition not familiar with the great fight this province put up for the farmers of Ontario and of Canada at the Federal-Provincial Conference held last April, last October, and last January? Of course, the hon. leader of the Opposition knows nothing about them, as he does not know what goes on around him. He does not know what this is all about.

I have sent to the hon. leader of the Opposition all the papers and proceedings in connection with these conferences, and I suggest he take them home, read them, and then try to see what is done and what took place.

We took down with us representatives of the council of The Federation of Agriculture. At that conference, for the first time, we had representatives of the agricultural interests, and, also for the first time, the municipalities of this province were represented in our delegation.

We know there are constitutional difficulties. As a matter of fact, if the hon. leader of the Opposition does not know there are constitutional difficulties, he must have been asleep for 20 years, because his government, back in 1935, helped to create those difficulties by an



appeal in connection with the so-called "Bennett legislation of 1935."

The Natural Products Marketing Act, and some other Acts, were declared invalid by the Privy Council, with the result that farm marketing has been left in a period of uncertainty since that time. It is all very well to say one can touch a button and cure these things, but to get agreement amongst 11 governments of this country, involving many of these problems, is a very difficult and touchy affair, and to obtain a constitutional amendment is one of the most serious difficulties we have in this country. I have always been in favour of the constitutional power to amend our own Constitution in Canada, but some of us have not been successful in that view, including Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent, with whose views I find myself in very general agreement in connection with that problem.

I promised the Ontario farmers that as and when a conference was convened, I would go down there and try to arrange for some complementary legislation to be passed here and at Ottawa to overcome these constitutional difficulties without the necessity of having a constitutional amendment, which means an appeal to Westminster.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture knows the fight we put up there to endeavour to secure legislation which would be complementary to ours. The hon. Minister knows what took place. The Federation of Agriculture can tell the hon. members what took place.

The feeling of the Federal Government—and I do not criticize them for it—was that until these Acts had been clarified by the courts of this land, they felt they should not intervene in matters which might possibly refer to provincial jurisdiction, although the borderline was very vague. So the only course left to us was to take these Statutes, and by arrangement have them referred to the Supreme Court of Canada for adjudication and clarification, and that we have done.

That creates the necessity for a session later on this year, when the

Supreme Court has rendered its decision, when we will have to pass our own legislation, which will be in accordance with its decision.

The other 9 provinces of Canada are all vitally interested in this move. From the Province of Newfoundland, across Canada to the Province of British Columbia, this appeal is of vital concern. Our move will then be, depending upon the decision, one involving a large number of points, and I will say to the hon. members opposite, and particularly to the hon. member for Peel, who had so much to do with this legislation, that we will pass legislation in this House, within the competence of this Legislature, and I will ask the hon. members to stand wholeheartedly behind the programme for this province, and not let all our legislation go down the drain.

Secondly, I will have our hon. Minister of Agriculture go to the Federal Government at Ottawa, and ask them, wherever possible, to give us complementary legislation to strengthen our hand, and the position of our province.

Thirdly, we will appeal to the Federal Government—and to the other provinces, if necessary—for an amendment to our Constitution to clarify and strengthen the position of the farmers not only of this province, but of all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition, in view of a programme like that—never before attempted in this province—what validity there is for the criticism he uttered this afternoon? I repeat it looks to me as if he went to sleep after the legislation of 1935, and now in the year 1956, he awakens and asks what this is all about.

MR. OLIVER: That is a very mighty pronouncement, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: There are many other things to which I would like to refer, such as water supply and pollution. As hon. members probably realize, in that connection, we are dealing with something which is going to be vital to the progress of this province,

to ensure an adequate water supply and to eliminate the contamination not only of our industrial but also our domestic water sources. A good and sufficient water supply, it seems to me, represents one of the great assets of this province, and is one of the things which will assist industrial development and create work and wages in this province. We will be introducing a Bill in connection with that matter, so I will not proceed with a discussion at the present time.

In regard to the matter of power: the hon. leader of the Opposition has said that the Speech from the Throne is an empty document. Mr. Speaker, I have already given the hon. members just a few items which underline and underscore the scope and importance of the legislation which is before this House, or will be.

In the matter of power, we have had references which ought to produce in the breast of the hon. leader of the Opposition a feeling of the deepest shame. He should read the paragraph relating to the growth of the use of power in this province. He should turn to the brief we submitted to the Royal Commission in which the requirements of Ontario—this great province—are set out, where in the next 10 years we are going to need 5 million more horsepower of electrical energy.

I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition to read the Speech from the Throne, not in the attitude he has done this afternoon, an attitude of grumbling complaint slipping back into an era in which he lived 20 years ago, but to read it in the light of the 1956 conditions. He should particularly read the paragraph in relation to power, and the requirements of this province which require the harnessing of new power sources such as thermal power and nuclear power. In a few years I would imagine that water power will be but a minor portion of the power to be used in this province, the balance coming from nuclear energy, from gas from the west, and other sources of a similar nature.

I would suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that he read the Speech

from the Throne in that attitude, considering the conditions in 1956, and looking forward to the prospects of this province, and then I would suggest that he, and the hon. member for Brant, go into seclusion and dress in sackcloth and ashes, after they read the speeches they made in repudiation of the power contracts, speeches made in this House 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in this particular subject, and last night I turned up the famous Act, "The Power Commission Act, 1935. An Act to declare the law in respect to The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, with respect to certain invalid contracts."

I would say to the hon. member for Brant that surely he does not like to have me refer to that incident in his life. The hon. leader of the Opposition—then the hon. member for Grey South—was just as bad. He sat on a corner of our benches I very well remember, in those days, with a colour which was a little different than the rose colour which was attached to the Liberal members, but he was always unhesitatingly a supporter of the Hepburn Administration.

He was never known to do anything but vote for them on every occasion; he obeyed the Whips, and was always in the chamber to vote, and he was one of the hon. members who supported the legislation which, I would say, in effect tore up Ontario's future. He was prepared to take it as a handful of paper, and to throw into the waste paper basket the future of this great province and this great land.

I often wonder what would have happened if that government had had the courage, and if the supporters of that government, including the then hon. member for Grey South, had had the courage to, instead of saying to the people of this province, "We are handing out doles," and that sort of thing; instead of taking the attitude that Ontario had no future, if they had done what we are doing today, developing the St. Lawrence, developing the Ottawa River, building dams and works and

developments throughout northern Ontario, and developing the Niagara River.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that was an attitude of defeatism, because there were two years in that period when the power requirements did not continue to mount, they lost their courage, their vision and their enthusiasm—if they ever had any—for this great land and province, and were prepared to say, "Let us forget all these things; let us put our people on the dole, and not go ahead with the construction of great works."

What would the future of this province have been today? What would our problems have been today? How much less they would have been if the hon. members opposite in their day, when they had the opportunity, had constructed dams and works and developments at one-third of the costs we are paying today? If that had been done, they would have gone a long way in meeting some of the problems which we have had to meet in this province. In fact two years after they went out of power, we had a power shortage in the Province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as regards some of the other items mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, may I very briefly say that in the matter of fiscal relations, there are studies to which every hon. member in this House should devote himself, studies which go back to the Sirois Report.

At the time the Royal Commission met in this chamber two weeks ago, I suggested to the commissioners that we were pleading for understanding, but in pleading for understanding I always made it plain—and I make it plain here—that as a great province we are not asking to get from beneath the load which is ours to bear. We are not only anxious, but have the desire to pull our full weight in the great Confederation of which we are a part, but I feel that we should have an understanding of our problems. We must understand that industry does not operate in a vacuum, that money is not earned in this province, and taxes are not collected

in this province, without creating very great and mighty problems.

In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I have felt in recent conferences that there has been a greater understanding on the part of other provinces in that respect. I was very much interested in the remark made to me by the hon. Premier of one of our western provinces, that they had had some industry come into their province and that they knew what it meant to service that industry and to provide the necessities and the requirements of the concentration of industry and the population which accompanied it.

And it must be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that 50 per cent. of the industry of Canada is located in Ontario. So when I plead for understanding, it must be remembered that under the latest proposals of the Federal Government with respect to the federal-provincial fiscal provisions, that adjustment grants are made to all provinces but our own. I am very glad indeed to stand here and say that we do not require any adjustment grants. However, we do require understanding, and I plead for that understanding on the part of the other governments in Canada. It appears to me that the way to get at least part of that understanding is for our own people and our own House to appreciate the problem.

It is proposed that these adjustment grants be paid, at least according to the figures we have now for the year 1957-58, as follows:

- Newfoundland, about \$11½ million.
- Prince Edward Island, about \$3 million plus.
- Nova Scotia, something over \$16 million.
- New Brunswick, nearly \$14 million.
- Quebec, about \$48 million.
- Manitoba, some \$14 million.
- Saskatchewan, \$21 million.
- Alberta, nearly \$17 million.
- British Columbia, \$3 million.
- Making a total distribution of about \$148 million.

A very large portion of that has to be earned in this province by industry



which is serviced, and must be serviced, by our province and our municipalities.

These things cannot operate alone, there has to be understanding about a great province which is beset by problems caused by development and the necessity of earning great sums of money which must be distributed across our country.

I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the payments of monies to other provinces of Canada in accordance with their needs. I am very glad to make this declaration about Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that I think they have a case and that our people here would be glad to see them get a better deal in those provinces.

I want to discuss now certain things in connection with the hospital matter to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred. I intend to speak on that subject later in the session, at a time when it is not 3 minutes to 6. At this time, I shall simply refer the hon. leader of the Opposition and hon. members of the House to what I said in April last in Ottawa. That has been followed, Mr. Speaker, in a succeeding conference by a statement which was made in October last on that same subject, which in turn was followed by certain submissions which we made—"proposals" if you want to call them that—to the other provinces and to the Government of Canada in the form of 5 submissions in October, and then a statement made by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) at the conference on January 23, and the submission which was made at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the hon. members of the House that in dealing with this problem in all of those sessions, I did not do so on a political level, and I do not bring that very great problem here on a political level. May I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that I have no desire whatever to take a sharp turn on the Federal Government or anybody in the Federal Government at all. I am not interested in anything other than good business for the people of this province and this

country—nothing else. I am not a bit concerned as to who gets credit for this or credit for something else. In my own political views, the best politics that ever can be played is doing the very best business possible for the people whom we represent.

Mr. Speaker, to reduce this subject to its shortest compass—and I promise the House I will take only a very few minutes—as the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, health and hospital insurance has been talked about in this country for I suppose some 35 years. In April last we asked that this matter be placed upon the agenda at Ottawa. The proposal was not placed upon the agenda, as hon. members know, without a very serious fight to get it there. The feelings which we have in this province are not common in some other places in Canada, and there was objection to it. However, finally we got this programme, or problem, placed on the agenda, not actually in the words "Health and Hospital Insurance" but in other words which I think conveyed probably the same meaning.

The position, sir, is this: if you are going to have an arrangement in Canada, it has to be, as far as our great industrial province is concerned, a universal, that is to say, a Dominion-wide or Canada-wide solution to the problem. May I point out to hon. members that it is easy to use loose expressions about Ontario being, for instance, a wealthy province. That covers a multitude of sins.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing so misleading as to say that Ontario is a wealthy province. It must be remembered that from the earnings of Ontario you have to support half of the undertakings of the Federal Government. In this province we have to earn for the other provinces—and we have, since 1945—very vast sums of money. As a matter of fact there are many things that we cannot afford to have in this province which some of the other provinces have enjoyed because they have been able to get free money that has no obligations attached to it.

I have not complained about this, Mr. Speaker, and I do not complain about it this afternoon. It must be remembered that this problem is one which will perhaps in its first year involve an expenditure, from the taxes of our people, of \$150 million from this province alone, having no regard to contributions and costs which are involved elsewhere, and which in the course of 5 years will probably go up to something in the neighbourhood of \$175 million or might even go to \$200 million.

That is a huge programme, Mr. Speaker, and I would certainly not want to stand in this House and "play politics" with a subject that is as great and as vital as that. Remember, that huge sum of money, if it is not rightly handled and the thing rightly done, and if it creates loads in this province which make it impossible perhaps for us to transport and to sell our goods, agricultural and others, on the markets of the world, we could very easily deal a very damaging blow to the economy of the province. I want to say quite frankly to the House that I think this matter can be done without doing that, provided we use judgment and care in the introduction of such a plan.

There are complexities to a hospital plan, even without getting into a general health plan which, I may say to you, I think is quite unfeasible at the present time in Ontario. I was quite interested in noticing the outcome of the votes in Saskatchewan, where the people in certain areas of that province voted overwhelmingly against the extension of certain of their hospital provisions and plans.

MR. D. MACDONALD (York South): For very particular reasons.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for York South may know the reasons.

MR. MACDONALD: Some time I will tell the hon. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: However I have read the newspapers from Saskatchewan and it is quite apparent that

when you get a vote in a riding or an area which is probably 3 or 4 to 1 against a health plan, there is something at least that should cause us here to have a pretty good look at it.

Some of these things I think should be very carefully considered. In my opinion, they should be considered in the minutest way, because we must remember that mistakes we may make in this very large problem can only be rectified by the taxes which we levy on our people, and the levying of taxes in a province such as ours can probably only be done in one way, and that is by the levying of a premium, and additional premiums, of course, mean additional taxes.

I believe that a system of contributory hospital insurance can be devised and that we can secure the acceptance of it by the majority of provinces in Canada and the majority of the population of Canada, as has been laid down by the Federal Government in its latest offer. I think that can be done, but I should say that the way it will be obtained is by taking a sane, logical and reasonable approach to this problem.

I was very much interested in a radio address delivered by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). I listened to his address and afterwards sent for a copy of the script and read it through very carefully, and I thought it was a very thoughtful presentation of the view which the hon. member had taken of that particular problem, and I should like to make that acknowledgment here.

The hon. member was referring to the matter of catastrophic insurance. We have gone into that problem in the very greatest of detail, and I can assure the hon. member that the question of catastrophic insurance is a very difficult one from an administrative point of view.

We came to the conclusion—and I am going to say to the House that we are going to have the people who have studied this problem available to the hon. members of this House in committee, where they can ask some of the questions we have been asked, so that hon. members will have the fullest

opportunity to obtain complete information on this great subject. I am hopeful and in fact I think this will be the case, that we will get helpful ideas from the 98 hon. members of this House on a matter which, I can assure you, is a very fundamental one to the people, not only of this province, but of this country.

In connection with catastrophic insurance, we came to this conclusion after the most careful examination, with respect to the principle of it. I have felt, as have many others, very favourably inclined to the view that it must be based on income, because ability to pay without undue hardship has to be gauged on the basis of income. That is the only way that one could do it fairly. In other words, a \$400 bill is a catastrophe to one person, but it is not a catastrophe to another. Indeed, a catastrophe may be caused one person by a \$100 indebtedness, and the problem has to be viewed in that way.

The only way that one can gauge it is on the basis of income, which is a very, very difficult thing to do administratively.

I say that these things have to be considered by the hon. members of this House, and I want to take everything we have and make it available. I will have all the submissions we made at Ottawa, everything that was said about these various plans, and I will arrange to have them furnished to each hon. member in the House.

When the Committee on Health assembles, I will have some of those who have advised me, the two representatives from the Blue Cross—very able men—Mr. David Ogilvie and Mr. Stanley Porter, and Doctor Malcolm Taylor of the University of Toronto, our own technical advisors from our Department of Health and our Department of Economics, and others, take up these various problems with the members of the committee. These things are needed by interested people for a sensible evaluation of this problem.

First of all, we have to fit in the complicated matter of the federal formula, into our own formulae, and our own proposals, and our staff is working on

that now. That, in itself, is a very large and difficult matter.

I have had numerous people ask me about it. They have asked: "What would be the coverage extent?" There is no use in misleading people as to the coverage extent of hospital insurance. It has to be a basic hospital insurance, which perhaps does not mean private rooms, but does mean basic hospital coverage in this province and this country, and yet some hon. members opposite speak lightly about our bringing down certain legislation.

May I remind them that before we can do that, we have to secure the agreement of 5 other governments in Canada and the Federal Government. When you come to your basic coverage, you have to translate your costs down to the cost per person, and have figures of the various indemnities there are in it, and then work out the general cost trend.

Anybody who disregards these things is not doing his duty to this province. There is no use entering into something where we know the costs will be higher than they are now, subject to certain things. This matter will be dealt with, I hope, at this session of the Legislature in connection with our hospital set-up in this province.

First you have to have a control to insure efficiency in hospital organization which will provide for the wise expenditure of every dollar. By that I am not inferring, by any means, that the expenditures of dollars on hospitals has not been wise. As a matter of fact, our hospitals, by and large, have done a very remarkable job. But remember this: when you get into a job of this sort, involving 5 million possible patients, and have to collect the taxes from them to provide for hospital coverage, you will have to make sure that the foundation upon which you build is a firm foundation, and that it is a sound foundation of hospital coverage.

With the Blue Cross, or any agency with which we have dealt in connection with this problem, we have been advised



that the fundamental to such a plan is the construction of hospitals of the type and nature needed in the various parts of Ontario. I would say, at the present time, in our general hospitals, our present population of 5,200,000 is well taken care of at the moment, but there is bound to be a growth of population coming after that.

We are well ahead in Canada in the matter of building convalescent and chronic types of hospitals. At the same time, in a plan such as this, we have to accept the fact that we must go further in the building of convalescent and chronic types of hospitals, despite the progress we have made. That seems also to be the experience in the other provinces, and the other countries with which we have had to deal.

The weakness in the federal proposal in my estimation—and we have argued this with great strength at Ottawa—is that we think it is a fundamental mistake to leave out the tubercular and mental patients. How in the world can you argue that you can collect premiums from patients to pay for hospital coverage, but when they become tubercular, or afflicted with a mental disease, they come outside the ambit of the hospital plan?

I do not think that adds up, and I am optimistic enough to believe that our view will be accepted. There has to be an integration into it of the present non-profit plan, which includes Blue Cross, and the rural and county co-operatives which are doing a very excellent and wonderful job in this province. I had a letter from one of my own co-operatives, which I passed on, in relation to the work they are doing, and their question was: "Mr. Frost, what will be done with our co-operative in connection with our present hospital coverage? What will happen to us if this plan comes into effect?"

That matter deserves a great deal of care to see that these people who have been operating these great non-profit plans, large and small, in the province, are adequately and properly taken care of in the introduction of a hospital plan,

which I hope will come about in this province.

In addition, of course, there is the effect upon the present employer-employee contracts in Ontario. That opens a very large field. We have some industries in which labour and management are sharing certain hospital coverage in the province.

We have some cases where perhaps it is all borne by the individual employees, or perhaps all by industry, and there is a very important coverage which must be taken care of, and, as I say, a problem of this sort, Mr. Speaker, is underscored by the fact that when you sit in an Ottawa Conference, as some of us have over the last 9 months, and listen to the problems which are brought forward by those who are our partner provinces, and must be our partner provinces, and must come into this deal if it is to go forward, there are created matters which deserve the greatest care and consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, beyond expressing my own belief that a hospital plan is possible in Ontario and Canada if it is done properly and done well and done in a way in which we do not add the costs of inefficiency into the taxes that must be paid by our people, the thing we plan to do is to take in everything we can, and take out all the mysteries of this great problem by making what we have done in our considerations available to the members of this House who themselves are deeply concerned and rightly interested in the province.

We are dealing with one of the greatest problems any government or any Legislature has ever attempted in a province such as Ontario.

It is difficult to compare jurisdictions but here in the Province of Ontario we have not a static population, we have a population which is growing. As I said in the conference this last time, I was able to refer back to only 5 years ago and tell the delegates to the conference that our great province had grown by some 700,000 people in the past 5 years. In other words, the growth was more than the total population of some of our provinces in Canada.

Remember, we have the complication of a concentration of industry, the influx of people because we are growing in the province at a rate of around 12,000 or 15,000 people every month. A good sized town in Ontario is being spread across the face of our province every 30 days. Because of the incidence of industry, we have great bodies of people moving to various places. For instance, today I suppose that we have several thousand workmen and their dependents working on the banks of the St. Lawrence River, we have the growth of the Manitouwadge and Algoma areas and Cardiff, we have people who are going by the thousands into these great mining areas, which were unthought of a short time ago.

These things create problems for us here, in the institution of a national plan, which do not exist in other places and other jurisdictions, and that is why I plead for understanding of a province which is one that is helping to bear the weight of this great country of ours.

I would say in conclusion that in the spirit of 1956 we will look forward with confidence to times of great challenge and perplexities, we shall have to take uncharted courses in times which are times of great opportunity. This is the time we face with confidence and the assurance that our great people in this province can do the job and can overcome the challenges in the years that lie ahead.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.  
Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have to deal with what we can, we are trying to build up the Order paper and we will deal with such legislation as there is on the Order paper. If there are any points or any Bills the hon. members opposite want held out, we will do so. Other than that we will refer all we can to the committees in order that they may start operating.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): No debate tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: I understood the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) were going ahead on Thursday. I have no objection, we can go ahead with the debate tomorrow if you would prefer. In fact, I would be very glad to, but I think perhaps they have counted on Thursday.

MR. MacDONALD: Arrangements have been made for Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.25 of the clock, p.m.











# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Farm Products Marketing Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading .....                        | 107 |
| <b>Labour Relations Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading .....                               | 107 |
| <b>Presentation of Reports</b> , Mr. Dunbar .....   | 107 |
| <b>Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow,<br>second reading .....     | 110 |
| <b>Municipal Arbitrations Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading .....                       | 111 |
| <b>Forest Fires Prevention Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, second reading ....                       | 111 |
| <b>Fire Marshals Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                                   | 112 |
| <b>Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts,<br>second reading ..... | 112 |
| <b>Conveyancing and Law of Property Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts,<br>second reading .....             | 112 |
| <b>Estates Tail Act</b> , Bill to repeal, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                                   | 114 |
| <b>Fraudulent Conveyances Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                          | 114 |
| <b>Limitations Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                                     | 114 |
| <b>Act Respecting Real Property</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                        | 114 |
| <b>Territorial Divisions Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading .....                        | 115 |
| <b>Public Service Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading .....                                   | 115 |
| <b>Motion to adjourn</b> , Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 115 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:  
The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of the Town of Chelmsford praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for the construction of watermains.

Of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for road construction.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Mr. D. MacDonald moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to be permitted to give a brief explanation which will cover the Bill I have just introduced, and also a second one which is along the same line.

At the moment, regarding the votes which are taken for a marketing scheme under The Farm Products Marketing Act or for a representation vote for certification of a union, the practice is that there must be a certain percentage of eligible voters, whether or not those voters actually cast their ballots. This is not the practice which is carried on, for example, in political life. Farm organizations and trade union organizations for some years have been making representations to bring this matter into accord with the practice on the political front.

Therefore, the purpose of the Bill I have introduced—and of the second one to be introduced—is to establish the democratic principle that, in a vote regarding a marketing scheme under The Farm Products Marketing Act, or a representation vote under The Labour Relations Act, the result shall be determined by the prescribed percentage of those actually voting, rather than those eligible to vote.

### THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MacDonald moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR  
(Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. First Report of the Minister of Lands and Forests of the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

2. Second Annual Report of the Department of Reform Institutions for the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Prime Minister. I am sure that he is greatly concerned, as we all are, with the struggle going on between the General Motors Corporation and the United Auto Workers Union, which is now in its 145th day.

I am quite sure that the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Labour are very much concerned about this conflict and I suppose, if there was an invitation from either side, they would be prepared to try to help in a settlement.

I am quite sure they are interested in the welfare of 17,000 people in the Province of Ontario—I will give them credit for that—and if they were asked, I am quite sure they would intervene.

I may view these things a little differently from most people, because I happen to be one of the strikers and up to a week ago I took my place on the picket line with the rest of the union members.

One of the contentious issues in this strike at the present time, in the efforts to arrive at a settlement, is the question of the Blue Cross Hospitalization, who shall pay the premiums—the corporation or the individual members. If the hon. Prime Minister could see his way clear at this time to make some official pronouncement as to what the plans are likely to be in respect to hospitalization, it might help to clarify the situation and help in arriving at a conclusion. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will see his way clear to give some indication on that point.

We regret very much that the strike is so protracted and prolonged. I feel quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the effects of this dispute will be felt in the City of Oshawa for the next 2 or 3 years.

I hope the hon. Prime Minister will see his way clear to give some indication of the government's plans in this matter.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): A short time ago I received written notice of this question, which reads:

As the long protracted strike between General Motors Corporation and the United Automobile Workers is now in its 145th day, and as one of the contentious issues is the question of Blue Cross or hospitalization, respecting who should pay the premiums, would the Prime Minister make an official announcement respecting the proposed hospitalization plans of the Ontario Government, so that the parties involved may be guided in their deliberations. Such an announcement could have the effect of speeding up a settlement of this protracted struggle.

That is the question which was sent to me.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to such a question may I say that anyone knowing anything about the General Motors strike and the issues involved in it, should be well aware that it is exceedingly difficult to understand what possible relevance this question could have to the settlement of that strike. I am surprised that the hon. member for Oshawa would not have so regarded the question.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I was speaking to some of them, over the week-end.

HON. MR. FROST: Just a moment, until I give the answer to the question the hon. member has raised. Of the two parties negotiating in the present General Motors labour and management dispute, neither one of the parties—the United Automobile Workers nor the management—has raised that question with me, in substance or even indirectly, or to any of the departments of government.



As the hon. member for Oshawa knows, the only question which has arisen between the negotiating parties is not to what organization the premiums shall be paid—

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Does the hon. Prime Minister deny that? I did not infer that. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not infer that.

HON. MR. FROST: I would quite agree with what the hon. member says. The services of the hon. Minister of Labour and of myself, and the services of anybody here, are available for trying to effect a settlement of that strike. Those services, as the hon. member knows, have been offered to those people time and time again and day after day. That is the present situation.

We would be glad to assist there at any time, but this question has never been raised with us. The reason, of course, is very apparent and I think it must be apparent to the hon. member. At the present time, the premiums are paid to the Blue Cross. Under a new system, premiums would be paid to a similar agency, representing in that case the people of Ontario. In other words, an agency of the people of Ontario would be substituted for the Blue Cross.

The question in the strike, therefore, is not as to whom the premiums would be paid—whether to the Blue Cross or to any other agency, but the fundamental question in this strike is who would make such payments—labour, management, or partly by each. That is the question and that is one of the subjects which is under negotiation at the present time.

The strike arose over certain points which have been the subject of negotiation and bargaining for a considerable period of time—145 days plus. The object of these negotiations between the two parties is to get the employees back to work and the industry operating. Quite obviously, the present conference of the Federal Government and the 10 provinces of Canada can have no im-

mediate bearing on the strike, nor on the points in dispute.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it must be plain that the settlement of this strike, getting the men back to work and industry operating, could not possibly wait upon an agreement involving the conditions presently imposed by the Federal Government. These conditions would involve a complete and a definite agreement in terms of operation between the majority of the provinces, which means 6. There must be an agreement between 6 provinces representing the majority of the people of Canada, which means 8 million people. Since there must be agreement amongst those majorities, obviously the settlement of this strike could not wait until that moment has arrived.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): That is a very illogical argument to make.

MR. MacDONALD: It is a speech, not an answer.

HON. MR. FROST: The negotiating parties are very able parties, the Union and the General Motors have very able people, and they have very realistically realized that such a federal-provincial agreement could have no bearing at all upon the solution of the present strike; in fact, it may have no fundamental bearing upon the points at issue at all.

That is obviously the reason why neither of these very able negotiating agencies, the Union and the General Motors management, have raised this point with me or with any department of this government. That is the complete answer and our position on the present situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome two groups of students to our Assembly this afternoon; a group from the Bowmore School of the City of Toronto, and a group from Humewood School in the Township of York.

Orders of the day.

## THE ONTARIO HIGHWAY TRANSPORT BOARD ACT, 1955

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 50, "An Act to amend The Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of Bill No. 50, "An Act to amend The Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955," I think I should point out to the hon. members of this House the fact that the provision for the establishment of the Highway Transport Board was passed at the last session of the Legislature, a year ago. The board was appointed and started its duties on November 1. It has been working overtime, trying to catch up with the backlog of work which had accumulated over a period of some months.

As hon. members of this House know, for a good many years applications for PCV licences and all matters dealing with motor vehicle transportation, as far as trucks are concerned, came under the Ontario Municipal Board. It has been realized for some time that the duties of the Municipal Board were too great. As a matter of fact, over a period of several years, the Municipal Board seemed to be more or less a "dumping ground" for all matters which the Legislature or the government did not seem to be able to find any other body to deal with. As a result, the duties of the Municipal Board have become very great, and have reached a point where it was felt that some relief should be given to it. It was quite logical that a separate board should be established to deal with the matter of the transports in this province.

Truck transportation in this province, as hon. members realize, has grown up within the memory of a great many of us. Some of us can remember the first truck which was used on the highways of this province. Today it is one of our more important industries and affects the everyday life and economy of our province.

It is with that in mind that the board which has been appointed will try to carry out its duties in the best interests,

not only of the industry, but of all the people concerned. It is my hope that, in a short time, a third member will be appointed to the board. Provision for a third member was made in the Act, and a full complement of 3 will form the board.

I would like to say the Transport Board has been busily engaged overtime, dealing with the backlog which has accumulated. It was quite natural in view of the amount of work which the Municipal Board had to do, that when they knew the Transport Board was being established, they had a tendency to leave any applications which came under the PCV regulations until the Transport Board commenced functioning.

Many hundreds of applications, hearings for renewals, and what-have-you have already been dealt with, and I have been assured by the board, as recently as yesterday afternoon, that they feel they now have the matter under control.

It is my hope, and it is their hope and intention, not only to be able to deal with matters coming before them from day to day, but also to be able to make, for the first time in this province, a complete and thorough study of our whole transport problem. I think this is very important in view of the importance of truck transportation in the Province of Ontario.

The board will not only make a study of our own problems here, but in discussion with the members of the board yesterday, it was decided they would invite members of transport boards from the other provinces to sit in with them, to try and formulate a regulated transport system of operation which would be in effect right across Canada.

They advise me that every province with the exception of one has a board which at least is comparable to the Transport Board in the Province of Ontario.

I thought I should point these matters out to the hon. members of the House, and when they make their studies—not only in respect to matters of a provin-

cial nature, but inter-provincially and also internationally—in connection with trucking, they will be reporting to the government. We hoped that some of the problems which have presented themselves over a period of years, and which have caused concern to a number of hon. members of the Legislature would be solved when we were able to establish this Board, which would take care of problems in connection with the issuing of licences, and the control of the transport industry in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are simply to clarify the Act which was enacted at the last session of the Legislature. They are self-explanatory.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Is this Bill going to the Municipal Affairs Committee?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Not necessarily. I do not think there is anything involved in the Bill which would make that necessary.

MR. OLIVER: How do you decide whether a Bill is to go to a committee or not?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: This Bill does not refer to municipal affairs. It deals only with the Transport Board and the amendments to the Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE MUNICIPAL ARBITRATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend The Municipal Arbitrations Act."

He said: In moving second reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend The Municipal Arbitrations Act," it was found by the law clerks in the department of the hon. Attorney-General that, in spite of the fact that a practice had been carried on in this province over a great many years in connection with the appointing of arbitrators for the municipalities by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-

Council, it was worded in the singular in the Act. Despite the fact that more than one arbitrator had been appointed in the province, the Act was still in the singular, and all we are doing here is making it possible by Order-in-Council to appoint an official arbitrator for the municipalities across Ontario.

We are also making provision for the appointment of an arbitrator for Metropolitan Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves second reading of Bill No. 52, "An act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for changes in several sections.

The first section was changed to include in the meaning of "owner," the holders of licences and permits under The Public Lands Act and The Provincial Parks Act, 1954.

Section 2: the title "honorary fire warden" has been discontinued. Under section 4 of the Act, all appointees will be "fire wardens."

The reason for the change from "honorary fire warden" to "fire warden" is that, in the experience of the department, so many people have met an honorary fire warden and did not pay any attention to what he said. We feel the word "honorary" should be taken away. If they are not "honorary" fire wardens, some people might listen to them, who, otherwise, would not do so.

Under section 3, subsection 1, the new feature of the subsection as re-enacted is that an enforcement officer may require the holder of a work permit to maintain an adequate fire fighting crew.

Over the last 3 or 4 years we have carried on a very extensive training in fire fighting, together with industry, in a co-operative effort between industry and the department. Over the last two years we have held meetings in the southwestern and southeastern parts of Ontario to which industries may send



their key employees to work with our department officials to learn the latest technique in fire fighting. This subsection merely means we expect the operators working under this section to maintain such fire fighting equipment in good repair and at specific locations, and such fire fighting crew, as the officer deems necessary for the control of fires which might be caused either directly or indirectly by the operation. We expect any person working under the Public Lands Branch or holding an ordinary licence fee on a Crown timber area to have some training in fire fighting.

Subsection 2 describes the liability for wages of employees engaged in controlling and extinguishing a fire. Mr. Speaker, the reason for that change is that we have found too often an industry is all too willing to throw the onus of responsibility for people fighting a fire on The Department of Lands and Forests, and we feel that until the hon. Minister decides who is responsible for the fire, they should be kept on the payroll of the industry involved, and industry should pay any compensation, and as far as any other factors involved, such as wages, are concerned.

In section 4 the meaning of "owner" as used in the section is clarified.

Section 5 is self-explanatory.

Section 6: the intent of this section is clarified. There is no change in the principles involved.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 62, "An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act."

He said: The provisions of this Act in its present form are unduly restrictive, as it may be desirable to make grants to associations, leagues, or societies which are organized for the purpose of fire prevention, but which are not incorporated. The amendment will enable grants to be made to both incorporated and

unincorporated organizations of that nature.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act."

He said: This Bill will provide for funds which are received by courts in the province, for example, by the accountants of the Supreme Courts, from foreign jurisdictions in foreign currency. It is required that when they are received, they are to be converted into the equivalent of Canadian currency at that time. That having been determined, it is to be recorded as Canadian currency in the records of our courts. The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the registration in Ontario courts of Maintenance Orders made in reciprocating jurisdictions.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act."

He said: As was mentioned when this and several other Bills were introduced for first reading a day or so ago, they are all complementary. They all involve a problem which, if solved by enactment, will abolish The Estates Tail Act and the clauses in other sections of other Acts which involve the Estates Tail.

For the information of hon. members of the Legislature, I might make some remarks concerning this ancient form of conveyance which dealt with an interest in lands, and read a list of the varieties of estates actually involved in

the conveyancing of land. We have several types of estates: an estate in fee simple, an estate for life, an estate from year to year, and an estate in fee tail.

An estate tail is an estate in fee simple with a curtailment; hence the name "estate tail" from the Latin *feudum talliatum*—literally, an estate with a tail.

The tail, or, as expressed in law, the limitation, consists of some words which limit the estate to certain heirs. The limitation expressed in its widest form would be a grant of land to "A" and the heirs of "A's" body. There are of course variations and entailed interests may exist in the following forms:

1. Tail general: unrestricted as to spouse and as to sex.
2. Tail male general: unrestricted as to spouse; restricted to male issue.
3. Tail female general: unrestricted as to spouse; restricted to female issue.
4. Tail special: restricted to two defined spouses; unrestricted as to sex.

I could go on and give further examples, but the effect of the limitation is that it converts an estate in fee simple into a restricted estate of inheritance.

The estate in fee tail is a statutory estate being first created in England by the Statute of Donis Conditionalibus (1285) in the reign of Edward I. The purpose of this Statute was to establish a means whereby the great lords of the day could restrict the devolution of their land to lineal descendants.

However, the tendency of the courts was to favour free alienation and in the course of the 14th and 15th centuries, they overrode the intention of the Legislature by various processes that barred the entailment of land. These processes culminated in an Estates Tail Act, 1833, which set up machinery whereby estates in tail could be converted back into estates in fee simple.

By the introduction of English law into Ontario as of October 15, 1792, the Statute of Donis Conditionalibus became part of our real property law.

The English Statute of 1833 whereby estates in tail could be converted back into estates in fee simple, was enacted

in Ontario by the Statute of 1846. This Statute still appears in the 1950 Revised Statutes of Ontario as "The Estates Tail Act."

Under the old 1285 law an estate could be curtailed to lineal descendants, but to circumvent this law, the 1833 Estates Tail Act set up machinery for the untailing of the land, that is, the conversion of the land into fee simple. The same situation exists in Ontario today.

The law now is recognized as obsolete, and I might just add that this type of conveyancing was abolished in British Columbia in 1921, in Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1906, in Nova Scotia in 1851, and in New Brunswick in 1854. There were none in Manitoba and none in Newfoundland. There have been none in Toronto since 1900, although I notice there was one estate in the neighbourhood of Chatham in 1880, and I am told by one of the hon. Ministers that there was one established about the beginning of the century in his riding.

The effect of the enactment of this particular Act, and the other Acts to which I will be referring, will not, of themselves, interfere with existing rights.

I move second reading of Bill No. 66.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General whether or not it will be possible to limit an estate in any manner after the passage of this Act.

If, perchance, a grantor or owner intended his estate to be limited to his own lineal descendants, what would be the effect? If I may make myself clear, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree with the hon. Attorney-General that this is an obsolete form of conveyancing, and in all probability should be repealed as suggested, but it has occurred to me that perhaps somebody in the future might have a very legitimate reason for curtailing or limiting a conveyance in the form suggested, but would

be precluded from pursuing his intention as a result of the repeal of this particular Act.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Waterloo North, I would say that the effect of this legislation, and the other Acts, will not prevent ordinary conveyancing and tying up of property in an ordinary manner.

There is nothing in section 3 as amended, or the other amendments, which prevents entailing within reasonable bounds, that is, the ordinary conveyancing method of making grants which are not limited entirely to fee simple.

Of course, this Bill will go to the Committee on Legal Bills, and no doubt there will be a number of lawyers present, and the Bill can be discussed very carefully section by section at that time.

### THE ESTATES TAIL ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to repeal The Estates Tail Act."

He said: I do not think any further remarks in relation to this are necessary, because I think my remarks in regard to the previous Bill covered all of these, and it deals with many of the aspects of estate tail which I have already mentioned.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend The Fraudulent Conveyances Act."

He said: Here again the amendment is only to keep this particular Act in line with the others, and bring about the over-all effects I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE LIMITATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend The Limitations Act."

He said: The remarks I have made previously are applicable to this Bill also. References to "estate tail" are deleted from it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### AN ACT RESPECTING REAL PROPERTY

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend an Act Respecting Real Property."

He said: This section, which this Bill repeals, is concerned with estate tail in the same manner as mentioned previously.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in relation to these 5 Bills which have been given second reading, may I point out to the hon. members of the House that these Bills will all be referred to the Committee on Legal Bills, and I think these, and all other Bills, should be subject to the closest scrutiny. I know the committee will be glad to receive any suggestions any hon. member cares to make in relation to them.

Sometimes, in connection with such technical Bills, they come before a Minister, and are processed along with other business in the usual way in Cabinet Council, and it is sometimes possible that technical matters, in effect, can be overlooked. I am anxious these matters should not be hurried, and that hon. members should have the fullest opportunity to discuss them, and indeed, hear any representations which possibly might be made by other groups, for instance, the Law Society, or any persons interested in these things.

Sometimes, a very small amendment proves to have far-reaching and wide results, and it seems to me the more consideration which can be given to these Bills, and the possible effects of them, the better.



I listened to the explanation by the hon. Attorney-General, and it took me back many years to lectures in Osgoode Hall and other places. I must admit that perhaps I am not a good lawyer any more, as it is a long time since I have dealt with things of this sort. I am very glad to seek the aid of people, particularly the hon. members of this Legislature, and receive whatever views they may have in connection with these matters. In this way it is possible to utilize whatever talents others may possess.

I think that is one of the important reasons why these matters should be referred to the committee. These are put forward as government measures, but not in any dogmatic sense at all, but submitted with the idea of taking full advantage of our procedures and our rules, and not, in any sense, as saying this should be the final result. As a matter of fact, if changes can be made to improve these Bills, I will be very happy indeed.

### THE TERRITORIAL DIVISIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 59, "An Act to amend The Territorial Divisions Act."

He said: This arises from a dispute between two municipalities in respect to an island in an inland lake which had never been registered. Now the island has been subdivided, and it has some value from an assessment standpoint, and both municipalities are claiming it, and this Bill makes it possible for the Municipal Board, upon application, to hold a hearing and decide to which municipality the island belongs.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT, 1952

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if this Bill may be held over. It is not to be referred to any committee?

HON. MR. FROST. No. I shall be very glad to hold it over, Mr. Speaker.

### THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

Hon. G. H. Dunbar moves second reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

He said: I think the explanation I gave on first reading is sufficient. It is simply to repeal an amendment which was placed in The Public Service Act in 1948, where it was stated that any casual worker or labourer, if he was being made permanent, could commence his superannuation only from the day he was made permanent. We felt that was not fair to the men, and we feel that, if they wish, they should be able to pay into the Superannuation Fund, an amount due as if they had paid from the commencement of employment, and we will match it dollar for dollar, and they then can obtain superannuation as from the date they start employment.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that advances all the Bills on the Order paper which have been printed. There are others which are marked "printed," but which the clerk tells me have not been put into the books of the hon. members, and, therefore, are not being advanced.

Tomorrow we will proceed with the debate on the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Following tomorrow's sitting, we will proceed with the debate on the motion every afternoon, and I would ask the Whips to be prepared for Friday afternoon, and every afternoon subsequent to the sitting tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4 of the clock, p.m.





# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, February 9, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, February 9, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| First Report, Standing Committee on Standing Orders .....   | 119 |
| Sarnia General Hospital, Bill respecting, Mr. Janes, first reading .....  | 120 |
| Township of Etobicoke, Bill respecting, Mr. Lewis, first reading .....  | 120 |
| Protestant Home of St. Catharines, Bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, first reading .....                                   | 120 |
| Canadian National Exhibition Association, Bill respecting, Mr. Frost, first reading .....                             | 120 |
| City of Woodstock, Bill respecting, Mr. Innes, first reading .....  | 120 |
| Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading ..                                      | 120 |
| Society of Interior Designers of Ontario, Bill to incorporate,<br>Mr. Cowling, first reading .....                    | 120 |
| City of Peterborough, Bill respecting, Mr. Auld, first reading .....  | 120 |
| Board of American Missions of the Lutheran Church, Bill respecting,<br>Mr. Wintermeyer, first reading .....           | 121 |
| Board of Education—Hamilton, Bill respecting, Mr. Connell, first reading .....  | 121 |
| City of Chatham, Bill respecting, Mr. Parry, first reading .....  | 121 |
| Chatham Board of Education; Chatham Suburban High School District,<br>Bill respecting, Mr. Parry, first reading ..... | 121 |
| Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Foote  | 121 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Murdoch, agreed to .....  | 164 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 164 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petition was read and received:

Of the Corporation of Assumption College praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the college to Assumption University of Windsor; and for related purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. D. M. KERR: In the absence of Mr. Hunt (Renfrew North), I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Kerr, in the absence of Mr. Hunt, presents the committee's first report as follows:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case sufficient:

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Chatham for special legislation to vest in fee simple, free of trusts, the lands known as Victoria Park.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Sarnia praying that an Act may

pass authorizing the Commission of the Sarnia General Hospital to borrow up to \$200,000 for current operating purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Etobicoke praying that an Act may pass enabling the corporation to enter into agreements for the acquisition of sewers and for related purposes.

Petition of The Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America praying that an Act may pass conferring upon the board the same powers and rights as were conferred by its Act of incorporation, Statutes of Canada, 1939, chapter 62.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Woodstock praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for the construction, maintenance, etc., of railway sidings, and to issue debentures therefor.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass effecting certain changes in the constitution of the Public Utilities Commission of the city.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass validating the sale of certain industrial sites.

Petition of the Corporation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company praying that an Act may pass vesting all property, etc., of certain subsidiary companies in the said corporation.

Petition of the Corporation of The Board of Education for the City of Chatham and The Chatham Suburban District High School Board praying that

an Act may pass validating an agreement between the corporations providing for the accommodation of secondary school students of the Chatham Suburban District, and related purposes.

Petition of The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing a pension plan, etc., for non-teaching employees.

Petition of the Corporation of The Society of Interior Decorators of Ontario praying that an Act may pass continuing the corporation under the name "The Society of Interior Designers of Ontario" and restricting the use of the designation "Registered Interior Designers."

Petition of the Corporation of The Canadian National Exhibition Association praying that an Act may pass to include the Chairman of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto as an ex-officio member of the association.

Petition of the Corporation of The Protestant Home of St. Catharines praying that an Act may pass dissolving the said home and vesting its assets in the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines to be applied to the erection of a home for the aged.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

#### THE SARNIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. C. E. Janes moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Sarnia General Hospital."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

Mr. W. B. Lewis moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE PROTESTANT HOME OF ST. CATHARINES

Mr. A. C. Jolley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Protestant Home of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

Mr. A. G. Frost moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Canadian National Exhibition Association."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE CITY OF WOODSTOCK

Mr. G. Innes moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE SOCIETY OF INTERIOR DESIGNERS OF ONTARIO

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate The Society of Interior Designers of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

#### THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. J. A. C. Auld moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.



### BOARD OF AMERICAN MISSIONS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

Mr. J. Wintermeyer moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### BOARD OF EDUCATION— HAMILTON

Mr. R. Connell moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### CITY OF CHATHAM

Mr. G. W. Parry moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The City of Chatham."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### CHATHAM BOARD OF EDUCATION AND CHATHAM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. Parry moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome to the Assembly this afternoon, 23 members of the Northwestern Chamber of Commerce, and members of the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

69th annual report of The Niagara Parks Commission, for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1955.

### THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate on the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, my first words would be words of congratulation to the mover and seconder of the motion. The presentations of these two hon. members of this House were worthy ones.

I would have only one slight reservation to make, and in so doing, I would repeat what has been suggested already on one or two occasions—that is, when these hon. members were speaking their minds and when their own thoughts and personalities were coming through, they were very able; they were very interesting; but where it was the product of some "ghost writer," it was a little on the dull side.

I hope this practice is one which can be dispensed with.

Unfortunately, I was not in the House when the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie was speaking, therefore I did not hear at first-hand his comments. It rather intrigued me, because I am not exactly certain what the hon. member had in mind, when he said he would be interested in coming down to the southern part of the Province of Ontario, and, so to speak, staking it out, including York South. I do not know what there is in the way of minerals in York South. I can assure the hon. member, on the basis of the latest information, that there does not seem to be any real prospect of mineral development in York South, but I can tell him that we have human resources of the very highest calibre, in fact, among the most politically mature in this province.

Since everybody else has been gloating about what happened June 9 last, and since we in this rather small corner of the House, even though we happen to be in the middle, do not have too much

to gloat about, you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for that small measure of gloating.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the hon. Prime Minister very sincerely for his kind words of welcome to myself and also for his comments with regard to my predecessor in the leadership of the CCF Party.

If I may be permitted just a brief personal word, I would add that I know of no responsibility that a person can take up which is more meaningful, more of a noble calling, than the responsibility of a person who is elected to a Legislature such as this in a democratic country.

Legislatures such as this are the focus of the whole democratic process. Personally, it is the kind of thing in which I have been interested from the time I entered high school and, therefore, it is the fulfilment, in essence, of a life ambition.

One can get into a Legislature like this, and take this machinery, which is the product of evolution down through the centuries, until today, with all its imperfections, it is the most perfect achievement of political man. One can use this machinery on behalf of the "little people," these people who, in a free country, are entitled to the benefit of it fully as much as those who may be more greatly blessed with the world's goods, or with power of one kind or another.

The only thing which I think should be added is that all this is a mechanical process, which for those of us who are members, is humanized by the personal friendships which can be made. I personally look forward to the opportunity to make these friendships among members of this House. I trust that will be possible, even though on occasion, differences—perhaps sharp differences—will occur between us on issues.

Having said that, perhaps I may move now to one point in which there is a rather sharp division of opinion. I do so, not because I originally intended to, but because the hon. Prime Minister, in fact, has invited it. I would like to

quote briefly from the hon. Prime Minister's remarks of Tuesday, with regard to an issue which has been one of the main issues in our political life of the last year or so.

I refer to the so-called "highway scandal." The hon. Prime Minister made some comment in regard to this matter, and in the course of interjections, in which a number of hon. members took part, I suggested: "Clean it up," to which the hon. Prime Minister replied:

Well, here is the very one to "clean it up," because I do not dodge these things. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South went all over this province making all sorts of statements, but I am not one who dodges the question in the House. This is the place where these things ought to be discussed.

Now that the hon. Prime Minister has raised an issue that in the minds of some of us was considered, perhaps, a dead issue—but which he believes is not dead and which should be reviewed, I welcome the opportunity, in fact, it is the first time I have had the opportunity, as a newcomer to this Legislature, of speaking briefly on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, this issue presumably was settled, but I want to say that the manner in which this government went about settling it, by a committee which brought forward a report which has been widely described by political friends as well as political foes of the government as being a "white-wash" has not really settled it. This government in fact deliberately avoided any consideration of the basic issue which is at the bottom of the highway scandal, namely the relationship of highway contractors and contributions to political parties, including the Conservative Party.

Let me add this, in words which I have used outside the House as the hon. Prime Minister is very fond of saying that people will say things outside they have not the courage to repeat in the House. I am quoting from a release of

a speech I gave in a town called Lindsay May 9 last. I will quote a few paragraphs:

Early in the highway scandals, 5 minor officials were charged and were brought to trial immediately in an effort to calm the public furore. Even though they pleaded guilty, and made full restitution, they all had to serve prison terms. Contrast that with the treatment of the construction firms and their officials. The firms pleaded guilty, made restitution, and got off with fines—because you can't put a construction firm in jail.

But the people responsible were those shaping the policies of the firms. Yet the government dropped their charges against these top officials for the fatuous reason, given in one case by the Crown Prosecutor, that the manager of the firm was "merely an employee."

As administered by the Conservative Government in this instance, clearly we have two sets of laws in Ontario: one for the little fellow who is expendable, and one for the big shot who is either a friend of the government, or knows too much.

Why were the charges against these big contractors dropped? I suggest to you that they were dropped, not only because Mr. Nelson conveniently died and took some of the evidence with him, but because the government dared not press these charges for fear that some of the contractors would spill the beans just like Mr. Dempsey has done.

HON. A. KELSO ROBERTS (Attorney-General): They had many chances to "spill" them during the inquiry.

MR. MacDONALD: I will come to that. Hon. members who were on that committee know the kind of treatment they received during the 6 or 8 months the cases were before the courts. They were promised that at the end they could bring forward their evidence, but they were given no opportunity to do so.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: They never produced anything during the election or before or since.

MR. MacDONALD: I shall continue quoting from my remarks in Lindsay.

If that had been permitted, the people of this province would have learned the truth about the financial tie-up between highway contractors and the "Tory" machine, with all the abuse of public revenues and administration that it represents. Then the "lid" would really have been blown off the "political pot" in Ontario.

If you want any further evidence of the validity of what I say, take another look at what has happened in South Renfrew. Why did the hon. Prime Minister find it necessary to drop Mr. Dempsey when the entire Conservative Party is financed in the same way? The only difference between Mr. Dempsey and many other Conservative candidates is that Mr. Dempsey was a little careless in the handling of his campaign funds, and the information leaked out. Let us face the fact: the Conservative Party cannot "clean up" the mess. It lives on this mess and is financed by it. That made the whole question of honest administration, uncorrupted by private interests, one of the basic issues before the people of Ontario.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member for Yorth South that he said that to the jury of the people, and he returns today to this House with 3 hon. members out of a total of 98.

MR. MacDONALD: This House sometimes reminds me of shows you see being prepared for use on the radio, where they flash a large card reading "Applaud Here." All the serried ranks of the back benchers will applaud at the right moment.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. You are the one who went out to Cochrane South. Your former member for Cochrane South walked out of the committee.



MR. MacDONALD: Yes, we lost out in Cochrane South because the Liberals crawled into bed with the Tories, with the Prime Minister. These so-called opponents of the government joined forces with them to defeat an Opposition member of some 12 years' standing.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow that to go unchallenged. Neither by word nor by action of any kind, did I enter into any agreement not to put a candidate in Cochrane South. It was my desire there should be a Liberal candidate in every constituency in the province. What the hon. member says is wide of the mark.

MR. MacDONALD: What the hon. leader of the Opposition says is strictly accurate as far as he is concerned. The heads of the Conservative and Liberal associations joined together back in the riding and it was a different story.

MR. JANES: Can you blame them?

MR. MacDONALD: Here is a comment. This hon. member does not deny it. He concedes what the leader of the Opposition seeks to deny.

I would like to add a bit of documentation to this basic charge in regard to the highway scandal. It is tied up with election funds, which is the real heart and soul of this problem, which the government has not dealt with.

Anyone who wants to get hold of a book on political science which deals with political Parties and how they are financed, will find that I am not stating anything new.

Every member of this House knows that most of his election funds come from these sources. If he doesn't get it himself directly at the local level, then he gets it indirectly from the central Party funds. In other words, headquarters receives it on his behalf, so that his conscience is salved.

If there is a Conservative member here who was not elected with some contribution from the fund, I wish he

would speak up and we may have him struck off the list of those who were elected in that way.

MR. PARRY: What about yourself?

MR. MacDONALD: I will give some information on how my campaign was financed, if the hon. member wants it.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of an article which was written on April 15, 1953, by one of Canada's most distinguished journalists, Blair Fraser. It is entitled, "Our Illegal Federal Election." It has a sub-title, "Most of our lawmakers become lawbreakers as the very act of getting elected." Here are one or two comments which I would like to put in the record, for consideration and documentation of the proposition I have just put forward in this House. Blair Fraser stated:

At the second level of contributors are the contractors—the people who actually get government business. These are the heart and soul and spinal column of provincial Party funds. . . . As a rule these donors make no pretense of impartiality—they give what they think is expected to the Party in power, and take out insurance with the Opposition.

In another place in the same article, Mr. Fraser says this of the old Parties:

There is nothing to choose between them in their methods of Party financing: both get approximately the same amounts from approximately the same sources.

Then he goes on to state that this kind of thing reveals a "moral dilemma of Canadian politics, one that causes deep worry and heart-searching amongst the thoughtful members of Parliament."

They believe in the democratic processes; they believe in the Party system—most of them believe with all sincerity that they are serving the public as best they can, and they cannot help but feel some doubt about the political funds which are part of the system's very foundation. Voters may well share their concern because,

directly or indirectly, we voters pay for the political funds in the end. Even more important, the methods of raising and spending campaign funds represent a real and growing threat to our democracy.

May I draw that concluding sentence of Mr. Fraser to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister: "The methods of raising and spending campaign funds represent a real and growing threat to our democracy."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to disabuse the mind of the hon. member that there is anything sinister that my Party, and the government I have the honour to head, would wish to hide. I want to say to the hon. member that I am not in debt, nor is any hon. member nor hon. Minister of this government in debt to anyone. The only persons to whom we are under any obligation are the people of this province whom we serve.

MR. MacDONALD: "Old Man Ontario" lives again.

HON. MR. FROST: It ill behooves a young man to come to this Legislature and throw slurs at people in public life in this province, those who have assisted for 150 years to build up this great province of ours, regardless of Party.

No corporation nor person can buy the Party I lead nor my government.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, that speech interjected into mine was a very interesting one, but significantly there is no denial that the Conservative Party is receiving funds from the highway contractors.

HON. MR. FROST: I have no knowledge of any funds obtained from any highway contractor at any time, and I may say that any contribution made to this Party is not made to me, in any way, shape or form, and is made without any obligation on the part of this government or any hon. member whatsoever.

MR. MacDONALD: We have heard all that before.

HON. MR. FROST: I am telling the hon. member. I ask him this, as an honest man; I say my statement is right, and I went before the people of this province in the last election and told them the same thing, and they believed me, as is evidenced by the ranks of my followers here.

MR. MacDONALD: But what the hon. Prime Minister has said today, he has said before. As evidence of that, I refer the hon. members of the House to the report of an address by the hon. Prime Minister made on March 29 last year, on which I commented in this way outside this House; and will now repeat it:

Premier Frost declares "I have no knowledge of the matter of contributions. That is the way it should be." But this is evasion of the highest order. The hon. Prime Minister may have no detailed knowledge of them; but he and his Party are quite willing to fight elections with them.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask where the hon. member gets his contributions?

MR. MacDONALD: My campaign funds and the financing of the CCF campaign are an open book. I have said that many times and I repeat it, and I invite the government not to cover up with that kind of an unctuous statement, but let them reveal where they secure the funds with which they fought the last election campaign.

The hon. Prime Minister has not answered that question before, and he is evading it now. All the government has done is to slur over this matter.

I remember another historic event in the history of this nation which illustrates how difficult it is to secure information with which to nail these things down, because the people in the "seats of the mighty" do not let it out.

I remember when a CCF member of the federal House raised this point, and

was instrumental in the establishing of a committee, which eventually secured the facts with regard to the Beauharnois scandal. It discovered the Liberal Party received about \$750,000 of this particular fund—and apparently the Tories were not in too good grace, because they received only about \$100,000. But the Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King, in the House of Commons, rose in his place and, folding his hands, said: "The Liberal Party is going through the valley of humiliation."

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, that had nothing to do with highways at all.

MR. MacDONALD: The only thing humiliating was that they were caught. The only thing humiliating to the Tory Party in the Dempsey affair is that they were caught.

MR. MALONEY: That was the Beauharnois matter.

MR. MacDONALD: It took some time—

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think we should cast any aspersions against a former hon. member of this House.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, you are correct. And I do not intend to cast aspersions on any former hon. member, particularly a deceased one. But I must say that this government's luck rather shatters me. In both the highway scandal, with Mr. Nelson, and in this issue, with Mr. Dempsey, the key people who had the facts died. One of the last remarks of the late Mr. Dempsey, made in this House, was that he was going to give the facts. But unfortunately he passed on, and his death got the government off the hook once again.

HON. MR. FROST: Does the hon. member suggest that we are responsible for the death of Mr. Dempsey?

MR. MacDONALD: Well, Mr. Speaker, has everybody made a speech who wants to?

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude these remarks with regard to this issue, which the hon. Prime Minister has repeatedly raised, by saying that one of the disturbing things about the whole episode was that not one single government supporter in this Legislature was able to get up and speak what was on his conscience on this issue.

MR. JANES: I think that is untrue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not say this in criticism; but if anyone dared to rise, he would have been crucified in precisely the way that the Tory machine attempted to crucify "Jim" Dempsey.

However, those restrictions did not hold for people outside this Legislature, among them fellow Conservatives. For example, the *Hamilton Spectator* summed up exactly how the government handled this whole matter. It did not deal with the "slush fund," but with another aspect, and I want to conclude my remarks by referring to one group of Conservatives who looked the facts in the face, and let their consciences speak in regard to the highway scandals. It says:

Companies were brought into court in connection with the scandals.

Very few individuals were.

In seeking to explain the withdrawal of charges against individuals, the special Crown prosecutor put it that no public interest would be served by continuing proceedings which would have involved a lengthy and expensive trial.

This is a most remarkable point of view.

Since when has the public's interest in justice been equated with saving time and expense? Does the public really prefer a relatively inexpensive white-wash to the spending of money on prosecutions which will make it certain that the public administration is going to be kept clean?

Is the minority report wrong in its statement that "it is hard to see how a company can commit a criminal act



except by the actions and volitions of human persons”?

And—this is the real crux of the whole business—since a company does not suffer by being fined, even if the fine is in 5 or 6 figures, whereas an individual does suffer if he is fined or sent to prison, where is the deterrent to further shenanigans if individuals are exempted by the prosecution from having to face the possibility of fine or prison?

This highways scandal has cast a shadow across the whole public administration of Ontario. The public should have been absolutely satisfied that its stewards had been performing their duty or, if not, had been punished for failing to do so. It has not been satisfied. If we had a prayer for Canada in this critical era it would be for a generation of public men who loved their country and were proud, brave, honest and free.

Then we should have no highways scandals, last year—or next year.

MR. MALONEY: What is the date of that?

MR. MacDONALD: It is dated February 18.

MR. MALONEY: What year?

MR. MacDONALD: 1955.

HON. MR. FROST: That was written on February 18, 1955, and within a very short time, I took the case to the people of Ontario, and there it was presented, and that the presentation was accepted cannot be denied, because the government was returned with 84 out of 98 seats, the largest following of any government in the history of this province.

MR. MacDONALD: For years I have listened to the Conservatives lament the fact, but in 1926, the leader of the government in the federal field was faced with what was known as the “customs scandal” and what did he do? He, a very smart political operator, “wrapped it up” in a political issue, and he got the people to back him, and caused the customs scandal to disappear.

May I say, with all respect to the hon. Prime Minister, that one of the most discreditable actions in his career, was that he “wrapped up” this highway scandal in the mantle of his personal reputation, so the people would not get the facts.

HON. MR. FROST: If the hon. member wants to rise in his place to make specific charges, let the hon. member make them. I do not think any hon. member of this House should call other people “blackguards,” and then produce no evidence to support his statement.

He may make his charge, and then it will be dealt with. If the hon. member wants to do that, I am quite content, and I am here to face such a charge, but I do not think the hon. member should stand in his place and call everybody, Liberals and Conservatives, “a lot of blackguards.” That is what he has said.

MR. MacDONALD: I have made specific charges and I repeat them: that the Conservatives received funds from highway contractors, and I invite the hon. Prime Minister to produce evidence to the contrary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member at the moment is imputing improper motives to other hon. members, and I am not prepared to permit that.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say that I know of no contractor in this province who has contributed to the Party funds, nor to the Party I have the honour of leading. I know of none.

MR. MacDONALD: Has the hon. Prime Minister ever investigated?

HON. MR. FROST: I know of nobody who has contributed to the Party funds.

MR. MacDONALD: That does not answer the question. That is an irrelevant statement.

HON. MR. FROST: I am under no obligation to anybody but the people of this province.

I may say this about Party funds; after all, political funds have to be supported by contributions. The Party to

which the hon. member belongs is supported by contributions, and his salary is paid by contributions.

MR. MacDONALD: And they are open to everyone.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, a great Canadian once said something which I think is true. He said:

Every good citizen ought to contribute to his church and his political Party.

With that sentiment I am in hearty agreement, and I believe it.

But I do want to say that no contributions were ever received by any political organization, which carried with it an obligation to do something for the contributor, and I stand in my place today, and say that I am under no obligation to anybody in this province—individual or corporation—to do anything because of any political contribution, nor has any hon. member of the Party which I have the honour to lead.

MR. MacDONALD: The key point, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Prime Minister is indicating he will not reveal where the Conservative Party gets its funds, and until he does most people will not be convinced by his words.

MR. MALONEY: The hon. member is not teaching school now.

MR. MacDONALD: I now want to move to another issue which has been touched upon by the hon. leader of the Opposition to some extent. In the economy of the Province of Ontario, it is perhaps the most disturbing feature to which we have to give some examination in this Legislative session. I am referring to the plight in which the agricultural communities find themselves.

Before some "back bencher" says "What do you know about farming?", may I inform him that I was raised on a farm, and I think I have perhaps milked more cows than many hon. members in this House.

The only point I want to make—and I am not going into great detail on this, Mr. Speaker, because we shall have the opportunity later on in the session—is that the hon. leader of the Opposition expounded what was undoubtedly up until now the widely-accepted thesis both amongst farmers and others. I am willing to concede it has been a widely-accepted thesis in the CCF.

The thesis is this, that when the economy has gone through this boom period, begins to level off, and then to drop, the first place in an economy where a depression appears is in the agricultural sector of the economy.

Farmers have said—and many interested in the plight of the farmers have said—for years, that if they face declining income, leading to a recession, it eventually develops into a depression throughout the economy as a whole.

For how long, I do not know, but at the moment this thesis is not proving true. Agriculture, hit with a drop of 50 per cent. in its income, is facing a condition which cannot be described as anything other than a depression. Yet, the fact of the matter is, that agriculture today is in a sort of pocket depression, in a booming economy.

I recall reading in the *Financial Post* 2 or 3 months ago, an article in which the writer spelled out this rather sobering fact, that a drop in the income in the agricultural communities is not having any serious effect on other industries, apart from a few, such as farming machinery. But generally the decline in farm purchasing power has been swallowed up in the extra income, caused by the development of many branches of manufacturing. Agriculture today represents about 7 or 8 per cent. of the industry of this province, with manufacturing representing about 84 per cent. of the income, so a drop in the agricultural economy does not have the impact it had in the past.

Therefore, the problem posed a very alarming sort of proposition for farmers, namely that the rest of the economy can continue to boom, while agriculture is left in a pocket depression within the

economy. No real solution appears to have been found, as to what can be done about it.

One of the answers is to strengthen the marketing legislation, which the government has indicated in the Speech from the Throne will be considered at this session, and we may have an opportunity later to deal with that matter.

But I want to make this suggestion, that passing legislation in regard to farm marketing will not meet the needs of the farmers if the government is not willing to back up the legislation, and to move in defending the spirit of law against those who feel it their duty to destroy it, such as the meat packers.

The problem here has been very aptly put by the lawyer for The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, when he said that marketing legislation is like a beautiful painting. A painter can spend a whole year perfecting it, but any fool can come along and in a split second punch a hole in it, so the whole effect is destroyed.

That is true in regard to the legislation we have concerning hog marketing, which up until now has not had sufficient "teeth" in it to protect the hog producers. Organizations such as the packers will go in and sabotage the legislation, and the government either does not want—

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member knows that this is a constitutional jurisdictional matter. We are going to the very limit under our constitutional jurisdiction.

MR. MacDONALD: You are now dealing with another aspect of it altogether.

HON. MR. FROST: No. The hon. member said we will let the hog market fall, because we would not give them certain legislative authority. Our trouble is that it is not within the power of this province to do that.

MR. MacDONALD: I am aware of that. That is another aspect entirely. When you pass farm marketing legislation, you must be willing to back up the

spirit of that legislation, and stop any infringement on the part of those whose desire is to break it immediately.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member that in this country we have built up farm marketing legislation, and we have given it our very best. It has not been a half-hearted method by any means. There is nothing to be gained by casting insinuations of that sort.

MR. MacDONALD: All you have to do is to go to any one of the farm organizations. If you go to the Farm Union, they will speak their minds in very plain terms; if you go to The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, they will tell you there is a growing dissatisfaction with this administration, to the point that they have asked for setting up a new Department of Marketing.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference, representatives of the Agricultural Federation and other farming organizations were present, and every move was explained to them, in conjunction with the officials.

MR. MacDONALD: The very fact that they are asking for a Department of Marketing indicates they are not satisfied with the administration at the present time.

I would like now to leave this subject, and touch briefly on an issue raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), namely, the labour situation in this province.

I do not know the reason why the Labour Committee has not met more frequently, but whatever the reasons were, I do not think they were valid. Today we have a situation, raised yesterday by the hon. member for Oshawa, (Mr. Thomas) in regard to the titanic struggle between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers. There are requests being made for some action to review our labour legislation.

I would suggest the hon. members read the editorials appearing in the *Globe and Mail* within the last month.



In fact, the *Globe and Mail* said it was one of the serious omissions in the Speech from the Throne, that there was no indication of the government's willingness to come to grips with this issue, and allow the committee to meet. Maybe the government has something "up its sleeves." Certainly, I would support the request of the leader of the Opposition that the Labour Committee meet this session.

I was a little touched, however, by the fact that the Liberal Party has found a new interest in this field. I can remember a year or so ago when an important piece of labour legislation was brought here, and after the Liberal Party had given a commitment it would support the legislation, they all remained in their seats and did not support it, when it came to a vote. That was in respect to the check-off.

I can remember last summer when the chairman of the policy-making committee of the Liberal Party—I believe he was speaking at Lake Couchiching—expressed some fear as to what is happening in labour circles, and suggested the two labour congresses should not get together, as labour was altogether too big. He never expressed any fear about corporations being too big—to wit, General Motors.

He revealed that what was in his mind was that the fear that militant CCFers were going to secure control of the Joint Congress, and that would not be good for labour. There was a glimpse of the real attitude of the Liberal Party toward labour, and labour is not being fooled for one minute.

MR. OLIVER: You have not fooled very many of them either.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps not, but there are other days coming, and we in the CCF will be standing shoulder to shoulder with labour, ready to work with them when they seek our help. We are looking forward to it.

Then, there was another event. Last fall the Provincial Federation of Labour—which has traditionally taken a neutral stand on politics—invited representa-

tives of each Party to speak to them. The hon. Prime Minister and I attended; I do not know if it was the happiest convention the hon. Prime Minister ever attended.

HON. MR. FROST: One of the finest.

MR. MacDONALD: It was not very fine in the treatment of the Conservative Party. The Attorney-General actually arrived just when the convention refused to pass a vote of thanks to the hon. Prime Minister, for the remarks he had made in regard to health insurance.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member gets all the cheers and I get all the "boos."

MR. MacDONALD: The Liberal Party was invited to send a representative, but they did not do so.

MR. OLIVER: On that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this; the hon. member no doubt received an invitation. I did, too, the day before the conference over the telephone, but never in my office came any written invitation to attend this meeting.

I am not afraid to speak to any labour group or farm group of this entire province, but the hon. member comes into this House as if he was the only one who had been a friend of labour and of the farmers. The hon. member will find, as he grows older, that both of these great industries are advanced in this House, and were so advanced, long before he even thought of coming here.

MR. MacDONALD: I hope the hon. leader of the Opposition feels better now.

MR. OLIVER: I feel better all the time.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, may I say that, in his own interests, it might have been well for the hon. leader of the Opposition, or somebody else, to have been there and explain what he is saying now.

MR. OLIVER: Why should I?

MR. MacDONALD: I am extremely surprised—

MR. OLIVER: You will be more surprised than ever later on.

MR. MacDONALD: The Liberal Party must have received an invitation—

MR. OLIVER: I said I did not, and the hon. member will have to take my word for it, whether he wants to or not.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, it just shows to what depths has fallen labour's lack of confidence in the Liberal Party, if they invite other Parties and ignore the Liberals.

However, that is enough for labour.

MR. OLIVER: That is nearly enough of everything from you.

MR. MacDONALD: I want to turn now to the question of reform institutions.

HON. MR. CECILE: Oh, this is it.

MR. MALONEY: Is the hon. member conversant with what he is going to say?

MR. MacDONALD: I realize the hon. member is a lawyer, but I do not think he has ever spent longer hours than I have—some 12, 15 or 18 hours per day for the past 6 weeks—finding out the facts regarding The Department of Reform Institutions.

MR. MALONEY: With what was the hon. member charged?

MR. MacDONALD: May I, at the outset, make this general observation, in the light of some of the remarks which have been made regarding what I have been attempting to do on this issue.

The CCF does not have to make any explanation for what might be described as "newly-found interest in penal reform."

Many of the hon. members of this House had the pleasure and privilege of sitting in this House with a woman by the name of Agnes Macphail. Many years will pass, if ever, before her name will drop from the top of the list of Canadian men and women who tried to do a job in bringing up-to-date our penal reform in Canada.

HON. MR. FROST: I would ask the hon. member to read the speeches of the late Miss Macphail, in which she gave the Department of Reform Institutions a clean bill of health. In fact, she was one of the great advocates of the reforms which have been carried out.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister, if he will wait until I finish, will not interject and get himself out on a limb.

Agnes Macphail was not in this House after 1951, but people who were a lot closer to her than any hon. member in the House now, know how she felt in regard to this matter before she died.

HON. MR. FROST: Miss Macphail visited the institutions, and I think that is more than the hon. member has done.

MR. MacDONALD: I shall go and visit them as soon as time permits. I will see what I want to see, and not be led on a conducted tour. I want to find out what really goes on in the institutions.

HON. MR. FROST: You can go tomorrow if you wish.

MR. MALONEY: I will go with you.

MR. MacDONALD: I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker, that my interest in this whole topic of reform institutions in the Province of Ontario was one which was thrust upon me. I was attempting to come to grips, as a new member of this House, with the various departments. I had chosen a number of other departments which are very important—perhaps more important, maybe

not — than reform institutions, in an endeavour to become thoroughly familiar with them before this first meeting of the Legislature.

But last fall, I found myself approached by various people who felt they had a complaint. It was just as with Miss Macphail when she took up complaints in the 1930's, to ascertain what was happening to people in our institutions.

In the terms of the over-all picture, I found myself approached by people who had been on the staffs of certain institutions, people who are now on the staffs of these institutions; also people in related organizations who are attempting to come to grips in this province with the question of modern penal reform in our treatment of prisoners.

The more these approaches were made, the more disturbing the situation appeared. Therefore when developments took place in Cobourg, providing me with an opportunity to present what I am convinced are actual facts, that I began to speak on this subject. It was at that time I discovered, as many others have discovered, that there is a far greater interest in this issue than most people had realized.

I must say, at the outset, that I have been amazed at the government's reaction to these proposals. There is no doubt about it, if one reads the stories which have been written in newspapers, and reads between the lines, that everything is not well. The hon. Prime Minister stands aloof from the battle, and says it is an inter-departmental affair.

The hon. Attorney-General made an unsolicited entry into this matter in a speech in the eastern part of Toronto, in which he declared himself as having nothing but contempt for attacks by opposition members who did not have the facts. Then he went one step further, and if the newspaper story is accurate, he dealt almost completely with the war record of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, a completely extraneous issue, because nobody ever has,

now is, or ever will, question the war record of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Just leave that alone and get on with your speech.

MR. MacDONALD: Certainly it is an extraneous issue, but the Attorney-General raised it. He has said nothing since that time. It was a cheap political venture.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member has said is completely at variance with the facts, when he says I have said nothing, as I have spoken on the matter on several occasions.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, since I do not attend all the meetings at which the hon. Attorney-General speaks—

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Then be careful what you say.

MR. MacDONALD: I have not seen anything more of what you did say on this issue.

The hon. Minister has described my efforts as "mud slinging" and "based on meagre and imaginary grievances."

I want to make this general observation, before I get down to specific cases, that all of my information is not, as the hon. Minister said, from disgruntled inmates, but it is from professional people of the highest standing; people who have left the Department of Reform Institutions, and taken positions in other organizations, in many instances at a much higher salary; people who left the Department of Reform Institutions, because, as they say, they were "sickened and saddened" at what was going on in the particular institution in which they were employed.

I am convinced what I have stated are facts. In fact, I have taken a great deal of trouble to corroborate with others the information I have received from these professional people. I have corroborated it with other persons who happened to be in the institution at that



time, so that human memory would not be permitted to trip them up.

What I have stated, and what I will state today, are not only facts—I venture this suggestion, that the government knows they are facts. If the government does not really believe they are—and I am not demanding this because I don't think it is necessary—but if the government really does not believe they are facts, the people from whom I secured this information will, under proper conditions providing for their protection, be ready to stand up and be counted.

May I make a further general observation. The hon. Minister stated that what I have said was “mud slinging.” From the headlines, it might have looked like “mud slinging,” but I would invite the hon. members to read the statements I have made. They will notice that in every statement I made, at least the first half or two-thirds was a discussion on basic principles and policies—misconceived principles and policies—of the department. My contention has been that they were not in keeping with a sound approach to penal reform. Then I illustrated the consequences of these policies in a particular institution, usually these illustrations were so shocking that, for very understandable reasons they created the headlines.

I want to congratulate the Press for the very full coverage they have given on this issue. Anybody who really wants to find out what I was saying was able to read past the headlines, and get at the facts.

May I begin an examination of the policies of the Department of Reform Institutions by referring to an extract from a radio address delivered by the then Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) on the “Ontario plan” as given over CBC, on January 31, 1949. It is as follows:

On many occasions during the past two years, visitors to the reformatories and industrial farms of this province have remarked ‘We had no

idea that the reform institutions of Ontario were anything other than “places where the inmates did ‘time’, and ‘hard labour’. Instead, we have seen in action the most modern procedures for the re-training of delinquents right here in our own province.”

Because of statements such as this, I am going to tell you in the few minutes at my disposal, something of the important steps taken by this province to help re-train and re-establish those persons who have broken our laws and have been sent to our institutions. . . .

The initial step taken by the new department was to devise an over-all treatment plan which has since attracted the attention of penologists from Canada and other parts of the world and is now known as “The Ontario Plan”.

I will not read any further—

HON. G. H. DUNBAR: Why not? Go ahead and read it all. That is nice reading. I am not ashamed of anything there.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not asking the hon. Minister to be ashamed of it. What I am saying is that there we have in this statement by the then hon. Minister of Reform Institutions — 7 years ago—a statement of the objectives of this government and the department. Not only is it a statement of the objectives but actually it implies—where it does not state—that it is a record of achievement.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What year was that?

MR. MacDONALD: That was in a radio address on January 31, 1949.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: If you look on page 1117 of *Hansard* for that year, you will find what Miss Agnes Macphail said about our system in Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: She said it was a dandy.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, she said it was a dandy, and merited more attention.

MR. MacDONALD: I repeat that people who were a great deal closer to Miss Agnes Macphail than any hon. member in this House know how she felt about reform institutions just before she died, and I can tell the hon. members it was a sharply-revised opinion.

In regard to this particular matter, may I refer to this voluminous tome, the report of the select committee, prepared 5 years later, in 1954. This is a summary of its conclusions:

Programmes in institutions are generally inadequate. The committee has examined them very carefully and the inescapable conclusion is that, with a few notable exceptions, Ontario's reform institutions are not living up to their name.

The Department of Reform Institutions has admirable aims, as expressed in its "Ontario Plan," but realization of these aims has barely been started. Advances have been made in the treatment of promising young "reformables" at the Ontario Reformatory, Brampton, and the treatment of alcoholics at the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic, Mimico. The sound principles of establishing industrial farms and making institutions as "open" as possible have been adopted. But the majority of persons sentenced to Ontario institutions receive while incarcerated no effective stimulus to reform.

That, in a "nut shell," was the conclusion arrived at by the select committee, which was made up of a majority of government supporters.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to proceed to some of the principal issues I have raised—to review them—and add more to them.

There is this question of "brutality." I have in my hand a report from the *Globe and Mail* of January 12, 1956, entitled, "Foote Denies CCF Charges of Brutality." In that article, he flatly

denies it. This article reads, in part, as follows:

Reform Institutions Minister Foote fired a broadside at Ontario CCF Leader MacDonald yesterday, accusing him of mud-slinging, and flatly denying the charge that "brutality and political interference exist in reform institutions."

I have here another interesting document. It happens to be an evening paper published in the town of Port Hope, not far from where the hon. Minister lives. It is entitled "Reforms Department Storm," and most of it is an attempt to defend the record of the hon. Mr. Foote. It reads in this way:

No one has ever denied that the incidents cited did occur. Mr. MacDonald charges that a "guard" struck an inmate of the Cobourg Training School for Boys, breaking his jaw. There are no guards in the school, but a staff member did strike a boy, who fell down stairs. He sustained a broken jaw and a broken arm. The man was immediately dismissed, and if the Children's Aid saw fit to employ him, that is the business of that organization which is not under the jurisdiction of Major Foote's department. Nor is it a government institution. This incident took place 3 years ago and was duly reported in this newspaper.

There is one instance of brutality—frankly admitted.

Two other staff members were dismissed for unauthorized punishment of boys. One was taken back on the staff in another capacity where he does not deal with the boys. This was done only after careful review of the case, and does not appear to be unwarranted interference on the part of the Minister.

So there are two other cases—frankly admitted. This paper in the Minister's home area concedes at least 3 cases of brutality. Yet, the hon. Minister says there were none.

I could add others, but I shall not at this time. I hope that the hon.

Minister will reconsider his whole approach, and not attempt to dismiss everything as mud-slinging. If he does not, I shall give the public some further instances of this nature at a later date.

In regard to the question of "political interference": unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, all I can do is cite the details of the one case which has received a great deal of publicity. I point out to this House, and to the public, that the basic facts of the case are not in dispute at all. But the hon. Minister comes to one conclusion; I come to another, and I am bold enough to suggest that the public agrees with me.

What are the details of that case? This is the case of a man whom the hon. Minister stated, as reported in a Toronto paper, was a friend of his; in fact, he was a Sunday School teacher in his church. He got a job in the institution. He was said to have strapped a boy without authority. That was a slight understatement, because he strapped a number of boys in the assembly-line fashion one night, when nobody else was around, and he thought it would not be found out. He was dismissed.

Some months later, the hon. Minister asked the superintendent to review the case. I ask the hon. members of this House if you were the superintendent of an institution, and there was someone on the staff who had been guilty of brutality, and the hon. Minister asked you to come and review the case, what would you do? What alternative would you have but take him back?

MR. MYERS: Does the hon. member remember the former House leader, Mr. Grummett, saying there should be more strapping; that every court should have a woodshed attached to it?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not agree with Mr. Grummett on that issue. Let me put it plainly.

HON. MR. FROST: The Party lines are falling down.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not have a split in that little group.

MR. MacDONALD: Here then are the facts of the case. To argue that this is not a case of "political interference" is just a little naïve.

Let me give you another instance. Some 3 or 4 years ago in the Cobourg School an appointment was to be made of a chief academic headmaster in the school. The superintendent at that time wanted to appoint a certain person, because that person had been in a training school. As I understand it he was trying to do what I think would be a very good thing, if you are going to build the Ontario Plan, that is, develop leadership. However, the superintendent found he could not appoint this person, because the department had decided that somebody else was to be appointed in his stead. So the other person was appointed.

Very shortly after he was appointed, it was discovered—how can one describe it without misrepresenting the situation—that he was a sex deviate. To put it accurately, he was a homosexual. This situation went on for a time, and was eventually concluded by the hon. Minister going down and conducting an investigation, and bringing in all of the boys who had been in contact with this homosexual, to gather the evidence. It was agreed that this man would have to go; but there had to be some saving of face, so the man was not dismissed immediately. He was kept on till the end of the academic term.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Just where did you hear all that?

MR. MacDONALD: Never mind where I heard it. Let the hon. Minister rise in his place and deny the statement I am making—if it is not factual.

So this is another case of political interference. When you have people who have been dismissed because of brutality, and then brought back to the institution; when you find people from outside being brought in to positions in the institutions where members of the existing staff of reform institutions are entitled to promotion, consider the demoralization produced in staff relation-



ship. It cannot help but increase the friction and the tension, which is exactly what happened in Cobourg, culminating in a situation in the spring of 1954, which had to be coped with in some way.

And what was the department's way of coping with it? By re-introducing corporal punishment. I recognize that the subject of corporal punishment is very controversial. There are even divisions in political Parties on the subject. I am not arguing the point today, but I want to tell this House that the overwhelming consensus of opinion among people who are professionally in this field is that corporal punishment does absolutely nothing toward reforming persons who are put into institutions. I repeat: the overwhelming consensus of opinion of the people in that field opposes corporal punishment.

In fact, the hon. Minister had an investigation made by a well-known expert, Mr. Sanford Bates, who intimated in his report that corporal punishment had nothing to contribute to a modern, twentieth-century penal reform programme.

I invite the hon. members of this House to look at a copy, dated June 21, 1955, of the *Hansard* of the joint Senate-House of Commons Committee, which met in Ottawa last year. They sent out counsel, one of their people working for the committee, who picked at random 15 cases of men who had been in institutions, and who had been the victims of corporal punishment. He interviewed each of these 15 cases, and asked them whether they felt that corporal punishment in an institution had helped them reform.

I invite the hon. members to read it, because every one, with one exception, stated that corporal punishment contributed absolutely nothing. The result was merely to make the man embittered, to make him even more determined to "buck" the authorities in the institution and when he got out, to "buck" society as a whole. Thus they came out unrepentant, which is, unfortunately, what happens to much too high a percentage of those leaving our institutions.

The attitude of the department, in re-introducing corporal punishment, is all summed up rather beautifully in a document I have here, which I want to read to the House. It is a reproduction in mimeographed form of a letter signed by G. Hedley Basher, Deputy Minister, Department of Reform Institutions, when it was decided to restore corporal punishment in the training schools after a period of 6 or 7 years without it. Here is the dictate laid down by head office, and if any hon. member feels capable of playing the role of Charles Dickens in this twentieth century, there is certainly need for his services. This letter reads as follows:

The following procedures have been laid down by the department in connection with discipline at this school:

1. There must be strict discipline. Any insolence or disobedience of a simple order shall be punished by strapping.

2. If a boy, who is disciplined as in (1) fails to co-operate, he shall be further punished by deprivation of privileges, sports, etc.—by reduction of diet and, if necessary, by detention.

3. All such punishments shall be administered under the direction or supervision of the superintendent or his assistant and in the presence of a second member of the staff as a witness, who must sign the Behaviour Record Book as such.

I want to read the concluding paragraph, not because it has any particular relevance at the moment, but for other reasons to which I will refer later.

In all cases where the strap, detention, deprivation of privileges or reduction of diet is awarded, an entry shall be made in a Behaviour Record Book and on the Daily Log, setting out full particulars of the breach of discipline, the name of the member of the staff who made the behaviour report and the name of any witness or witnesses concerned.

Yours sincerely,  
(signed) G. HEDLEY BASHER,  
Deputy Minister.

I just want to suggest to the House that both in tone and content, the spirit of that departmental letter is not only back in the age of Charles Dickens, but I sometimes wonder whether it has escaped the medieval age. That is the outlook laid down, as it were, by the Deputy Minister of this department.

Now, I want to go on to another institution I have dealt with publicly, and that is the Galt Training School.

The main question in dispute here is whether or not a 12-year-old girl was kept for 92 days in confinement. I think the hon. Minister—in what must have been for him an unfortunate Press conference—is reported in the *Toronto Telegram* as making this statement, "There was no continuous period of confinement."

HON. MR. FOOTE: That is what I said.

MR. MacDONALD: I have here a copy of the *Toronto Telegram*, dated February 6, with a heading:

92 DAYS DETENTION?

YES, GIRLS' SCHOOL HEAD ADMITS

HON. MR. FOOTE: Read the article further down.

MR. MacDONALD: I have read it.

HON. MR. FOOTE: About having the superintendent "hit the headlines."

HON. MR. FROST: You were complaining of your speeches being distorted by headlines.

MR. MacDONALD: I was not complaining. What I was saying was that the rather sensational aspect of what happened in this school, was the basic reason for these things getting into the headlines.

HON. MR. FROST: Your headlines, or the newspaper's headlines—

MR. MacDONALD: The key point is, was this girl kept 92 days in solitary confinement? Here the answer of the superintendent is given as "yes." There is this question still at issue, Mr. Prime

Minister—because I know what is in your mind—that at what point in that 92 days' detention was this girl permitted to join one of the work parties—in other words, get some break from continuous detention, day and night?

MR. MYERS: Let me say something about that—

MR. MacDONALD: You can say it later on.

At what point was this girl permitted to come out and take part in the work parties? If the hon. Minister could give us these facts—

HON. MR. FOOTE: When you are quite through, I will give them to you.

MR. MacDONALD: My information is that this girl was kept in solitary confinement for 6 to 8 weeks at one stretch and it was only on account of the pressure among staff members and the indignation aroused by the fact the girl was becoming pallid, and her condition was getting worse, that she was let out. Let hon. members stop and consider what would happen to him if he were forced to stay in the cell, not permitted to get out of it for weeks on end except to go to the washroom—

MR. DAVIES: We have had this point of information brought up time and time again. These are very serious charges, and I feel the hon. member should come out and say honestly and fairly, "My information is so-and-so," from "such-and-such."

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. members know that if my informants were identified without being afforded proper protection, pressures could be brought on them, and in all probabilities they might lose their jobs. I have no intention of sacrificing people who have provided me with information. I repeat what I said earlier: I am convinced these are facts. I am equally convinced the government knows them to be true. But if the government really believes otherwise, let them provide proper protection through subpoena and testimony under oath, and my informants will speak.

MR. DAVIES: Let the hon. member table the facts.

MR. MacDONALD: I will not reveal the names, until we have a situation where protection can be afforded.

MR. LAVERGNE: The hon. member would not know a fact, if it hit him in the face.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: If I were back teaching in school, I would have some difficulty in deciding whether that comment came from a Grade 3 pupil—

MR. MALONEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would say it was a very beneficial thing for the school children when the hon. member decided to give up teaching.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not object, Mr. Speaker. If hon. members want to play it rough, you lay down the rules, and I will play it accordingly.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You agreed to the Queensbury Rules at the beginning.

MR. MacDONALD: I think we were discussing the problem of the confinement of a 12-year-old girl. I wish to remind the House that this child was in detention for 92 days. She was 12 years old; admittedly she was a problem child, and high-spirited, and was going to be difficult to tame and fit into society, but she was being treated in a manner which was certain to destroy all possibility of reforming her. After being confined for such a long period of time, this 12-year-old girl ended up by trying to take her own life.

Here is another significant part of the story. The child's whole nervous system was going from bad to worse, so what was done for her? She was fed sedatives. But she had been driven to such a point of desperation that she decided

she was going to end it all, so after she had saved a handful of the sedatives, she took them. That did not do the trick, so, later on in the same day, she slashed her wrist with a piece of glass in an attempt to take her life. At that point—finally, at long last—the Department of Reform Institutions gave up, as far as Galt was concerned, and it was decided she would be transferred to the Mercer, where, according to the information I have within the past month, she was getting along relatively well.

What a condemnation, Mr. Speaker, for a training school which is presumably set up to look after the welfare of juveniles, that a 12-year-old girl was treated in such a fashion as to cause her to attempt to commit suicide, and then when she was sent to a closed, adult reformatory, she got along much better.

I have two testimonials, as it were, which I would like to submit regarding the Galt school.

On Monday last, this week, a girl about 14 years of age who had run away from the Galt Training School, and had been out for 3½ or 4 months, voluntarily entered the Mercer. During the time she was out she had kept the authorities at bay so that they could not find her. She finally concluded that, after all, she did not want to lead an underground existence all her life, so she got in touch with her mother, and her mother's lawyer, and through contact with the department, it was agreed she would return to finish her term. But she said she would rather die than go back to Galt. So she also was sent out to the Mercer, where she is now finishing her term.

MR. MALONEY: What does that prove?

MR. MacDONALD: It gives an illuminating glimpse of failure to help girls in Galt—illuminating, that is for anybody who wants to stop and consider it.

MR. MALONEY: You have given us two—out of how many?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.



MR. MacDONALD: Secondly, I have a letter which I would like to read into the record. It will be read as it is written here with slight changes to avoid disclosing the place from whence it came. I read this to the hon. Minister some 2 or 3 weeks ago, when we spent an hour and a half in his office, and he is aware of its contents.

This is from people who are active in Children's Aid Society work, who are pillars in their community, people who are not only raising their own family, but have accepted a social responsibility through Children's Aid to help unfortunate juveniles. Many times they have kept children in their home till they had been placed—in an institution, or elsewhere.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member that when he reads a letter he must be prepared to table it.

MR. MacDONALD: I am willing to table this letter on the one condition that the identity of the persons who wrote it will not be revealed.

MR. SPEAKER: The letter must be tabled as is.

MR. MacDONALD: I count upon the assurance of this Legislature and this government, if they want this letter tabled, the names will not be divulged. These people know what is going on in the institution, and what I am doing is bringing here the testimony of people who know whereof they speak.

MR. MALONEY: Then why not give us their names?

MR. KERR: You are the man who should table it.

MR. MacDONALD: The letter reads as follows:

We have followed with much interest your investigation into the training schools at Cobourg, Bowmanville and finally at Galt. We agree fully with what we have read.

My wife and I have been working with the Children's Aid Society. In

May 1954 two sisters of 13 and 14 years of age were placed in our care by the society while their case was being investigated. They were with us almost 3 weeks and were sent to Galt. They were industrious, healthy girls, eager to please us and very patient and co-operative in spite of constant visits from investigators. We became very much attached to them and agreed to visit them and take them back when they were released if they would work with us.

Since that time they have written every week, we have answered each letter and visited them each month. We had them with us for their Christmas leave in 1954 and again this year. The older girl was released this Christmas and has started attending high school and living with us.

Until Christmas 1954 the one girl had never been punished, and the other one only once. When we returned them to the school after their leave Miss Bentley was in charge. She at once began to make cruel remarks and to remind them that they were beginning another "6 months' stretch." She was so brutal that we were shocked and had to leave them broken-hearted.

From that time on conditions for them became worse and worse. The older girl has a stoppage in her speech and this seemed to infuriate the supervisor and they were both punished many times. We asked the Children's Aid to help us have the girls released and we agreed to take full responsibility. The society was fully aware of the situation and agreed with us that the situation was very bad. However, as they had other girls in the institution at the time they hesitated to act. They did agree to write asking for a report on the girls' progress hoping this show of interest might have some effect.

We asked the society's advice on appealing to the Minister of Reform Institutions. After careful consideration they advised against it on the grounds that unless we were able to

secure Miss Bentley's dismissal she would be certain to take reprisals against the girls.

We wrote the school asking that at least one of the girls be released at the end of the class term in June. We were assured that it would be considered but when the time arrived our representative Mrs. Forbes phoned us that the supervisor had refused.

We then asked that the older girl be released in time to enter high school in September. This also was refused and we went to the school to make a personal appeal. Miss Bentley immediately lost her temper and told us they were "the worst liars in the school," "typical delinquents" and "the most stupid girls in the school."

They were doing very poorly in their class work due to the fact that they were under such severe strain and lost time through detentions. We again considered asking the department's help but received information that made it clear to us that the supervisor could not be reached in this way. The older girl was in detention across the hall from the Indian girl at the time of her suicide attempt. Your investigation has given us the opening we have been hoping for. We are willing to do anything in our power to have this institution rid of its trouble. We have found Miss Bentley entirely unco-operative, vindictive, terribly cruel and extremely rude to parents and visitors. She has never had the grace to rise from her desk to welcome us or to bid us good-bye. She has gone out of her way to embarrass our girls with unkind remarks. She has searched them in a most disgusting way in our presence.

We are willing to meet you or your representative at any time and place suitable to you and to answer any questions and give any help within our power.

MR. MALONEY: I submit the entire letter must be read, not simply portions of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Let the hon. member proceed with his speech.

MR. MacDONALD: I suppose the remark by the hon. member was supposed to be humorous.

MR. MALONEY: Let the hon. member read the letter.

MR. MacDONALD: I would suggest that the hon. member do not try to use his legal tactics here.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I do not want to embarrass the hon. member by any comment at all, and, as far as I am concerned, I will not embarrass him by asking him to table the letter, but that is the rule of the House, that anything which is read must be placed where the hon. members can see it. If the hon. member desires to go on in that obscure way, I do not think people will place much credence in that.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to show this letter to the Prime Minister, and I am confident the House will accept his word concerning its authenticity.

MR. MALONEY: I thought you said they were connected with the Children's Aid Society.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

MR. MALONEY: They are not.

MR. MacDONALD: They are working with the Children's Aid Society.

MR. MALONEY: What capacity do they occupy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member may be a good lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but he is simply confusing the issue.

MR. MALONEY: Now that the hon. member has referred to it, Mr. Speaker, it might be well to have the rule strictly adhered to. He has given the name of one person in that letter, and I see no

reason why the author of that letter should not be disclosed publicly to this House, so we will know who it is.

MR. MacDONALD: I said that the letter could be referred to the hon. Prime Minister, for his assurance of its authenticity.

MR. MALONEY: That does not comply with the rules of the House.

MR. MacDONALD: Will the hon. member kindly sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MALONEY: I have complete confidence in the hon. Prime Minister of this province, but I do suggest that the hon. leader of the CCF Party should be obliged to table the name of the author of that letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue his speech.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point I want to get back to on this Galt Institution, is this.

On one occasion a group of people visited the Galt school. In walking down a hall, they met one of the girls, who impressed them. When they asked her background, the comment of the superintendent was that normally they were not interested in the girls as individuals.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Where did you hear that?

MR. MacDONALD: This "individuals-don't-count" approach to juveniles in a training school is utterly incomprehensible to me. It is at variance with all modern treatment programmes. In fact, the select committee report deplored the general failure to adopt an individual approach. This is found at page 212 of the report:

It is impossible to overemphasize the need for detailed and individual studies of each inmate. When such studies are not available, institutions

must give much the same treatment to the old and the young, penitent and recalcitrant, minor offenders and hardened criminals. That this situation should have been allowed to persist in most of our institutions is regrettable, and to allow it to continue in the future would be absurd.

In other words, without an individual approach to discover the need of a child, you have no possibility of reforming that child—or very, very little possibility.

Just how confused is the thinking of The Department of Reform Institutions on such a basic point as this, is revealed in a recent development.

I have in my hand something which perhaps many hon. members have seen. It is an advertisement appearing in the *Globe and Mail*, seeking applicants for the position of superintendent for the new institution which is going to be built at Galt. It reads:

Wanted, a superintendent for the new Ontario Training School at Galt. This school will receive the incorrigible group from the main institution at Guelph.

I ask the hon. members to consider the significance of the word "incorrigible".

HON. MR. FROST: They would not be there, if they were not incorrigible.

MR. MacDONALD: "Incorrigible" means that they are not capable of training.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: No, that is not right at all.

HON. MR. FROST: Out of 5 million population in this province, there are children who can be taken care of in no other way. They are incorrigible.

MR. MacDONALD: There are children in this training school who, except for the grace of God, Mr. Speaker, might be your son or daughter, or mine.



HON. MR. PHILLIPS: You are giving an entirely wrong definition.

MR. MacDONALD: Contrast this approach with a CP report, carried on the wire last November of the remarks of the warden of the Oakalla Prison in British Columbia. This is not just a casual observer, but a man in charge of an institution with 1,000 inmates. He speaks in sharp criticism of Canada's backward penal reform, and he ends up by saying:

Sharp criticism of Canada's penal programme was voiced by Warden Hugh Christie of Oakalla Prison in an address here.

"It is a tragic failure in effect and expense," he said. "Maintenance of each prisoner costs \$25,000 a year which means that the 1,000 prisoners in Oakalla represent a \$25 million potential indebtedness in British Columbia."

"Across Canada there are 100,000 prison admissions each year, or a potential indebtedness of \$2,500 million.

"But the most tragic failure is the fact that almost 70 per cent. of prisoners in provincial jails and more than 70 per cent. of inmates of federal penitentiaries come back."

"Compare this with the 80 to 90 per cent. of the cases which are successful the first time we treat them in borstal homes and the prison farm.

"Nobody is a born delinquent. It is not hereditary. There is not a living person who is delinquent, who can not be cured if he is given attention enough.

"Because it is caused we can understand and treat it. It happened because of society's lack of attention to a particular problem.

"Paddling can be therapeutic, but Oakalla does not favour it because we don't know what the effect will be, and crushing our opposition is an out-of-date technique."

This is the modern voice in penal reform. But here our department calls them "incorrigible." I note the hon.

Minister of Health says I am giving a wrong definition of it, but I do not know of any other definition you can put on it, other than the normal one.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member believes that statement himself.

MR. MacDONALD: I would not have made it otherwise, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: We have in Guelph a fine institution. Some years ago we had about 20 young men there who, after a baseball game, wrecked the place, tore the chapel apart, and burned the furnishings in a part of the structure, and order was restored only by transferring them to another institution. We are now building the institution at Millbrook to take care of just such people, because they are, in fact, incorrigible. What else can you do with them?

MR. MacDONALD: My basic criticism of the institution at Galt is that there is inadequate individual treatment of the children.

The part-time psychiatrist can do little more than diagnostic work, separating out those children who are mentally ill or retarded, for transfer to the appropriate institutions. In a visit of one day a week it is impossible to follow through with any treatment of the girls left there. There is now no psychologist on the staff. Social workers have been intentionally eliminated. There can therefore be no follow-up with individual treatment which offers the only real possibility of rehabilitation.

Because there is neither adequate nor trained staff for treatment, much of the diagnostic work of psychologists and psychiatrists is to no avail, for it merely gets filed away, for periodic reference rather than a guide to treatment.

Even worse, in many instances the professional diagnosis of inmates is ignored and overridden in the blind pursuit of custodial objectives, which contaminates the thinking of those in our institutions.

HON. MR. FROST: Who said that?

MR. MacDONALD: I am saying that. This is my conclusion, my summing-up. I have this portion of my remarks written out—the only portion, as a matter of fact, that are written.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is good.

HON. MR. FROST: I think that is very fair.

MR. NIXON: Who was your “ghost writer”?

MR. MacDONALD: I wrote it myself. This is my first speech in the House, but I didn't need a ghost-writer.

MR. MALONEY: It sounds like it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member that I think he is right in reading a portion of his speech, upon which he wishes to lay emphasis. I do not think there is anything to the contrary in the rules of the House nor in practice, and I think it is all right.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

As I mentioned in many instances the professional diagnosis of inmates is ignored and overridden in a blind pursuit of the disciplinary and custodial objectives which dominate the thinking of those who control most of our institutions.

In this case of the 12-year-old girl at Galt, what is the point of having professional advice available when the advice is never sought, or is ignored, by throwing the child in for a lengthy detention period? That is what was done. And who is to blame when the child's spirit is broken to the point of attempting to commit suicide?

This is a particularly shocking aspect of the many contradictions to be found in what goes on in these institutions. Last year this Legislature spent some time discussing the case of the boy who committed suicide in Guelph. This was

the lad who had been struck—and I ask the hon. members of this House to take a particular look at this:

—while in bed, incidentally, at Cobourg—and his nose broken . . .

HON. MR. FOOTE: He fell off a train.

MR. MacDONALD: And after he got home the hon. member for Wentworth took up his case, and raised it with the department.

MR. CHILD: He admitted he fell off the train and hurt his nose while climbing up a ladder on the train.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There is nothing about toll roads there.

MR. CHILD: There is everything else.

MR. MacDONALD: Eventually he was transferred to Bowmanville, was released, got into trouble again, and was committed to Guelph. The professional diagnosis of this boy revealed him to be very mentally disturbed, so much so that it was recommended that he should not be placed in detention because of the likelihood that he would attempt something desperate. This recommendation was ignored. The boy was placed in detention, where he took his own life.

If the hon. Minister does not believe what I have stated is true, let him check the records.

This is not only tragic, but it illustrates an even larger tragedy: that much of what is potentially good in our reform institution set-up is cancelled out by the blind adherence to punishment as the cure-all. There are many potentially good elements in our reforms institutions. No one has ever questioned the fact that there are hopeful developments within the department. Among them are institutions such as the drug and alcoholic clinics; and the greater, though, as yet, extremely inadequate use of the professional services of psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers.

But the effectiveness of even these hopeful developments is minimized because the hard core of administrative policies remains unchanged. These basic policies—I repeat—are essentially the nineteenth century, military-minded, punitive approach.

The basic problem in our reform institutions is that the department is at war with itself. The old and the new approaches to penal reform live side by side, unresolved, unintegrated, almost in open conflict with each other. The Minister gives voice to the modern approach, and that provides the window dressing for public view.

But, with all respect for the Minister, we must face the fact that he is not the dominant personality in the department, shaping its day-to-day policies. That person is the Deputy Minister who is a relentlessly consistent exponent of the old punitive, almost purely custodial approach to penal reform.

The influence of the dominant views of the Deputy Minister, particularly with the unfortunate absence of the Minister through illness, so that the old attitudes were completely uncountered, has reduced our reform institutions to little more than Basher's empire. And the motto of that empire is "bash 'em."

The problem with our Department of Reform Institutions is that it is a bad example of schizophrenia. It is a split personality, so unresolved and at war with itself that it is unable to do the job for which it is maintained, even though it has many of the physical means at hand with which to work. If our Department of Reform Institutions were a person, it would be a fit subject for committal to the neuro-psychiatric centre at the Guelph Reformatory.

May I say this to the Prime Minister, that this is not simply an intra-departmental issue as he has treated it to date. We can never have an effective penal reform programme in Ontario; your so-called Ontario Plan will remain a sad dream, unless and until these relentlessly consistent exponents of the old school are removed. As things now

stand, much of the money we are now spending on reform institutions is so much money down the drain. It is not achieving the purpose for which it is being spent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many other issues in the reform institutions I would like to discuss. But there will be other occasions in this Legislature when we can deal with them—for instance, on the Estimates—and I propose to come back to them at that time.

I want now to make some particular references to the matter which I think will probably be the highlight for the people of Ontario in the Throne Speech. At long last there is a possibility of getting at least a partial health plan or health insurance. We, in the CCF, regard this with a feeling of satisfaction—I find it a little difficult to find a word to describe it—

MR. CHILD: You said last night it was "hooley."

MR. MacDONALD: I will come to that. Anything I say outside of the House, I will repeat in the House.

For 37 years we have had the Liberal Party promising to set up a scheme of health insurance, but nothing has ever been done about it. Recently the Conservatives have been deriding the Liberal record, but actually their record is not much better. It took them until 1943 even to start lip service to it. Before then they were opposed to it. You can find many who voiced opposition to it before 1943—and since, as a matter of fact.

In 1943, the Conservative Party was elected on a 22-point programme, and one of them was that they would provide "health coverage for all." Thirteen years passed before they got around to doing something about it. However, let us not complain, maybe something is going to happen.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): We hope.

MR. MacDONALD: Personally I do not propose to speculate because we might as well wait until we get the



details, which the hon. Prime Minister assures us will be forthcoming through the Standing Committee on Health.

But I want to make this point to the House, that a partial health plan cannot compensate for the inadequacy of the government's so-called "human betterment programme." Down through the years, the government has trumpeted in loud acclaim their achievements in this field. But let's look at them. I have a document here which is a very illuminating one. I invite the hon. members to take a look at it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is not the 22 points, is it?

MR. MacDONALD: No, they would be too long and boring.

This was a document distributed at the Federal-Provincial Conference last October. I suspect the hon. Prime Minister has seen it. It was distributed by the Federal Government in an attempt to make their case that .45 per cent. of the population was a suitable jumping-off place beyond which the Federal Government would share in the costs for unemployed; .45 per cent. of Ontario's population is about 25,000 people.

So they set out in graph form here what is described as "The Provincial Social Aid Case Load Considered in Percentages of the Population." This is in the form of a graph. We find at the top of the list that about 1.35 per cent. of the population is in the case load of the province of British Columbia. You can go down the list, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick—these Maritime Provinces which have such difficulty and have so few resources with which to work—all with a smaller case load than British Columbia, but larger than that of Ontario. In fact, after you go through the whole list, and get to the bottom of it, you will find the provinces of Alberta and Ontario showing about .45 per cent. of their population being the case load.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to my friend, Mr. Speaker—

MR. MacDONALD: You will have an opportunity, when I am through, Mr. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: Including those lower than .45. As a matter of fact, a special formula had to be introduced to get them in at all. It was only about .35.

MR. MacDONALD: You are speaking about another aspect altogether. With Nova Scotia's chronic unemployment in Cape Breton they conceded a lower percentage point for her threshold, beyond which the Federal Government will share unemployed costs. But that does not alter the fact that Nova Scotia's case load is higher than Ontario's.

HON. MR. FROST: That was not last February. It was started in April, and continued in July. In Alberta they do not give assistance, and their case load was so low—

MR. MacDONALD: Well, let's get back to Ontario. If I were in Nova Scotia, with my name, I probably would be welcomed, but let me repeat that Ontario has the lowest case load of any province across this nation.

HON. MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. MacDONALD: The graph is right there. Surely the hon. Prime Minister is not denying the existence of the graph, or saying that it is incorrect.

HON. MR. FROST: I think you have the graph upside down.

MR. MacDONALD: I am glad to see the hon. Prime Minister resorting to humour to evade the point, because he cannot deny it.

This government has for a long time been promoting what they call "the human betterment programme," but even with that, the province has a lower case load than any other province. Why is that the case? Let us take a look at it.

HON. MR. FROST: The conditions are so good, under this good government.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes, "Old Man Ontario" once again. It is wonderful how the hon. members respond. I sometimes wonder how the hon. Prime Minister can absorb all the fullsome praise heaped upon him by his supporters. Why, during the election, it even reached a point where one faithful candidate told the public that we should be thankful, for men like Dr. Salk, Albert Einstein and Leslie Frost don't turn up in every generation.

MR. MALONEY: Peace, it is wonderful.

MR. MacDONALD: I sometimes wonder how the hon. Prime Minister can stand it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: Let me take one or two examples of so-call "human betterment." The first is the supplement to the old-age pension. If you read the papers, you will see the present Legislature in British Columbia proposes to raise the supplementary payment to \$20 beyond the federal pension of \$40.

MR. CHILD: Where do they get the money?

MR. MacDONALD: In Saskatchewan, it was raised last year to \$20 in case of need, and in Alberta, it was raised \$15, while in Ontario it still stands at \$10.

HON. MR. FROST: All the other provinces you mentioned have the sales tax.

MR. MacDONALD: How does it operate here? If the municipality is presented with the case of an old-age pensioner who is in dire need, that municipality will conduct an examination, and if they find that his need is desperate, they will agree to give an extra \$10, of which amount the provincial government will pay one-half. The responsibility for granting the pension does not rest with the Provincial Govern-

ment, but with the municipality, and the result is that in Ontario, where there are 300,000 old-age pensioners, with some tens of thousands faced with extreme hardship, do you know how many are getting the supplementary allowance?

Hon. members, it is 1,795. The total amount of money this Provincial Government is paying to meet the conditions of the old-age pensioners in destitution, at the present time, is less than \$100,000 a year, out of a budget of \$400 million. And this government designates that as a "programme of human betterment."

Let me move on to another aspect, that of housing. I know when you touch on housing, the hon. Prime Minister has a wonderful technique; he gets up and swings his arms in his characteristic fashion, his "Old Man Ontario" theme, and says that last year we built from 35,000 to 40,000 new houses, giving the impression that this was an achievement of the Provincial Government. That is not the case. These homes were built by people on their own initiative, with their own money, or money they could borrow under The National Housing Act at Ottawa.

Experience with The National Housing Act has shown that the average cost of a home is somewhere between \$11,000 and \$12,000. To finance such a home requires an income of approximately \$4,000. But—the great majority of our people have incomes below \$4,000, below \$3,000 in fact. That would definitely include the great majority of people who are working for the Provincial Government as civil servants.

On that basis of calculation, these people simply cannot build homes. The only way you can build homes, to meet the needs of two-thirds of our population, is to have a low-rental housing programme, and the experience all through the country has proven time and time again that that is the case. So if you want to judge the government's housing record, look at low-rental homes.

Once again, the government acknowledges their need, pays lip service to it.

Five years ago, the hon. Prime Minister, speaking at a convention of mayors and reeves in London, said that the objective of the government was 5,000, and up as high as 25,000 low rental homes. But do the hon. members know how many homes this government was responsible for building under this programme? At the end of 1955, it was 1,791.

MR. LAVERGNE: The hon. member is not including Eastview.

MR. WARDROPE: The hon member does not know what he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: I suggest the hon. members do not know what they are talking about. For these are the latest figures. So, what are we doing? We are building 35,000 homes for the top one-third of our population, and this government's programme has built on an average of 350 homes per year in the last 5 years for the bottom two-thirds of our population. Yet they call that a "programme of human betterment."

Finally, let's take a look at education.

My good friend, the hon. Minister of Education, announced the other day, an increase in grants. I really cannot blame him for getting up and making the statement he has, because I honestly believe, when he first became the hon. Minister of Education, he engaged in a battle to get adequate support for education. But he has become weary of the battle, and today when a few crumbs are thrown his way he thinks the whole province will be jubilant.

HON. MR. FROST: Since when does \$110 million become crumbs?

MR. MacDONALD: He said there will be an increase in these grants from \$4 million to \$6 million. But what has happened to our education costs? If you

take a look at the latest figures available, you will see our current expenditures on education are going up about \$22 million a year. And yet this government comes along with that grand gesture of largesse, this increase in grants by \$2 million, and thinks the province should be very jubilant.

The hon. Prime Minister mentioned something about \$110 million. I do not know where he got that figure. I trust that figure will change between now and the time the Budget comes down, because it will be \$125 million or \$130 million, because that is what is required.

HON. MR. FROST: It may be.

MR. MALONEY: It will be everything which is required anyway.

MR. MacDONALD: To get education expenditures into perspective, go back to 1952. You will find that was the last year the province budgeted more from the provincial treasury for education than for highways. In 1952, our highway budget was \$52 million, and our educational budget was \$67 million. Well, what has happened in the interval? Our highway budget has gone from \$52 million to \$176 million, more than trebled. Yet education—which the hon. Prime Minister said last session was Ontario's great problem—has gone from \$67 million to about \$100 million, an increase of less than 50 per cent.

Moreover, on this question of whether the government is meeting 50 per cent. of the over-all costs of education, I wish the government would quit trying to kid the public. In the federal House the Conservatives moved a motion the other day, decrying the government for its lack of candour. Well, this government might take the advice of their fellow Tories, and be a bit candid on this promise to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of education; they have never fulfilled it. The percentage has been going down each year since 1945 and yet, when I raised this matter the other day, the hon. Prime Minister and the Provincial Treasurer joined in saying something about 90 per cent.



Furthermore on this issue, I would like to quote a sentence from the *Globe and Mail* of Thurs., February 2, 1956:

The brief exchange harkened back to an old Conservative promise to pay 50 per cent. of education costs, a pledge that opposition Parties have repeatedly dredged up.

HON. MR. FROST: Did you ever read the 22 points?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I have read them every time I want to be amused.

I am not dredging up old promises, but rather, I am trying to nail to the mast a claim to achievement on the part of this government which is simply not true.

I have here a leaflet which the hon. member for Leeds, the hon. member for Russell, as well as the hon. member for Nipissing were familiar with in their three by-elections last year.

MR. CHILD: Which were very successful.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, they were. I wish the people had known the facts, and they might not have been so successful. This is what they sent to the people as point number 5:

More than one-half of the over-all costs of education in Ontario is paid by the provincial treasury.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, is it Parliamentary to say that is a "fib," or what term does one use when one wants to say something is not the truth? Let us have a little bit of candour in this issue, and stop talking about something you have done, which is not part of the record.

Mr. Speaker, if I may draw my remarks to a conclusion—

MR. MALONEY: Watch that finger. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should watch his finger.

MR. MacDONALD: There would be more purpose served in watching your tongue than my finger.

My chief complaint against the government on these issues is this: if we did not have the money to do these things, there would be some excuse for the inadequacies of their programme. I know what the Prime Minister is going to say. He will suggest that we have an expanding economy, that we are the victims of our own prosperity. This is the Queen's Park lament at this time.

Sure, we have problems. But precisely, because of our increasing economy, also we have the means with which to do these things. To go around saying we are the victims of our own prosperity, with the kind of repetition we have had in the last few months, is really ludicrous; it is just about as ludicrous as if the richest man in town went around saying he has not the money to meet his needs.

We can meet the basic needs of the people of this province. And if we did, the government "human betterment" programme would not be window-dressing—with only 1,795 pensioners on supplementary pension, with only 1,791 low rental homes built in 5 years. On that kind of a programme I say "shame."

MR. MALONEY: Wait until I get a towel, I want to cry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: When I think of the Province of Ontario and its possibilities, I am reminded of a story, Mr. Speaker. It is a story that is told of Sir Christopher Wren 300 years ago. It was Sir Christopher's genius as an architect that created many of the magnificent cathedrals in England.

The story is told that one day Sir Christopher, unrecognized, was strolling among the workmen on the job. He interrupted one of them with the query: "And what are you making there?"

The workman looked up at him, and gruffly replied: "I'm making only two bob a day!"

Sir Christopher moved on. "And what are you doing?" he asked of another workman.

"Oh, I'm just chipping stone," came the grudging reply.

Sir Christopher moved on again. "And what are you doing?" he asked another workman.

The workman stopped and drew himself up to his full height. With a gleam in his eye and a ring of pride in his voice, he said, "I'm building a cathedral."

Mr. Speaker, we could be building a cathedral in the Province of Ontario. Nowhere on the face of the earth are there 5 million people with such a chunk of God-given resources. But we are not building a cathedral. We are building something which is a much more modest structure—much, much below our means.

And for that reason, I move, seconded by Mr. T. D. Thomas:

That the amendment for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be further amended by adding the following:

That this House further regrets that proposals to establish a partial health plan in co-operation with the federal authorities are not accompanied by action to compensate for the inadequacies of the government's present programme for human betterment, as evidenced by:

1. Only 1,795 of the approximate 300,000 old-age pensioners in Ontario are receiving the joint provincial-municipal \$10 supplement to the federal pension.

2. Only 1,791 low rental homes have been constructed in the past 5 years on a government programme of from 5,000 to 25,000 announced in 1951.

3. Despite the government's long-standing promise, and oft-repeated claim, that they are meeting 50 per cent. of the costs of education, provincial grants have dropped to just over 30 per cent. of over-all expenditures, so that Ontario is today devoting a smaller proportion of our annual income to education than any other province.

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker: I

offer you my congratulations on your election to your important office, after a long and successful career in this House.

I would like to commend especially the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. These are great speeches to have in the records of this House, and will do much to enhance the prestige of the Legislature. In comparison with them, I am afraid that the most of us will sound rather prosaic.

May I refer to the hon. leader of the Opposition and thank him for his kind references about me yesterday. I regret he showed some concern over the fact, as he says, that the recommendations of the select committee have not been implemented to any great extent. May I remind him that the successful treatment centre at Guelph, which the hon. leader of the Opposition hoped would be opened soon, has already been opened, and has been running successfully for a year.

I have a report here which I will send over to him, telling precisely what we have done about implementing the recommendations of the select committee.

May I extend to all the new members a hearty welcome and a wish that they may find political life all that they hoped it to be.

I may say for myself, that after 8 years—which is not much compared to some of you—I have suffered no great disillusionment. True, it is not a very tranquil life, but it has its moments and continually offers great challenges and splendid opportunities for the service of our people.

Perhaps I should say a special word of welcome to the leader of the CCF Party, who in this 25th session of the Legislature, takes his place for the first time. I wish him success in his important position. I recommend him as a member of the smoke or smog committee, for he has a powerful proboscis. He can smell smoke where there is none. When I invited the Press, the radio and the television to visit my institutions, he saw it as a smoke screen. How little he

knows those gentlemen, in spite of his alleged connection with the Press.

At least I didn't send the Press on a bum steer, as he did, to wallow in a mass of misinformation to the detriment of the department, and without casting much credit on the imaginative and mischievous author.

The question of Ministerial responsibility is one that I willingly accept, with all its implications, but how far can this doctrine be pressed, if the Minister is not even allowed to move an official from one appointment to another without a great hue-and-cry being raised—even the CCF Party has made some changes, or the present leader would not be here. From what we heard today, I think there might be changes yet to come.

MR. MacDONALD: Why was the hon. Minister going to move him before he promoted him?

HON. MR. FOOTE: There is a little carved owl above and behind the hon. member who knows as much about reform institutions as he does, but who is keeping quiet.

Political interference was alleged but not substantiated. If there was any political interference, I was the one interfered with, for every attempt was made to deter me from doing what I, and the Director of Training Schools, and my senior officials, considered to be the right thing.

There was nothing sinister in the transfer of the Cobourg superintendent to Brampton, and there was nothing political in that, or in any of my dealings with him or his staff. Further—and I hope the hon. members will accept the word of the superintendent—the superintendent absolutely denies that he made the statements attributed to him in the press. In his own words, "I made no such statements to the press—nor to anyone else."

Two cases of alleged brutality were brought to my attention which I denied and still deny. I will give you the facts and you can judge for yourselves.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister will have to inform the editorial writers in his area.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon. member did not read it all. It was a very good editorial in a very good paper. . . . The first concerned a Supervisor, Walter J. Smith, This man was appointed in 1952 and showed himself most kindly to the boys under his care. So much so that he took boys from the school to his home and his summer camp on week-ends. After two years' service in the school, Mr. Smith strapped 7 boys from his group who were misbehaving. I did not say "boy", I said "boys" in the report I gave before. The Director of Training Schools gave me this report on the incident:

The punishment could not be described as severe and did little more than to impress upon the boys that Mr. Smith was displeased with their conduct.

I might say this superintendent had a neighbour at the lake who ran a little store and rented boats. He was very kind to the boys who were visiting the supervisor; he loaned them boats and treated them kindly. When the boys went back to the school, they broke away one night, went back to this man's place of business, broke the window and staircase, and committed acts of vandalism.

MR. MacDONALD: Is that why he struck them?

HON. MR. FOOTE: So I would suggest that sometimes these boys are on a mischievous side, not perhaps incorrigible, but they need discipline.

With this report before me, I could not come to the conclusion that there was evidence of brutality. . . .

MR. MacDONALD: Why was he dismissed?

HON. MR. FOOTE: He was not dismissed. If the hon. member would just keep quiet for a minute, I will tell him. The hon. member had a long field



day, repeating a speech which he made on the radio the other night. It was not much good then and it did not improve with the repetition.

. . . Nevertheless, the punishment of the boys was unauthorized so Smith was suspended and resigned. When he later asked me to consider taking him back on a maintenance job, I told him to see the superintendent, and it was on the superintendent's written recommendation that he was taken back as a night watchman, where he is doing a good job.

The hon. member does not believe anybody, no matter what his position in the government or in the various departments. I have sat here for 8 years, but this is the first time I have ever heard an honoured and valued civil servant attacked in this house.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I did not attack the civil servant; I attacked the ideas for which he stands.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon. member named him.

MR. MacDONALD: I attacked the ideas for which he stands.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member named Mr. Basher and Miss Bentley, and attacked them in the most positive language, and in a most offensive way.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member should be ashamed of himself.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He is a "hit-and-run" politician.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister will find me running in his direction.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Some one has referred to a meeting at which the hon. leader of the Opposition was not present. I was present, and there was some dissension there, concerning a person named Mr. Kelly, taking some office,

and the charge was made that he would be more concerned with the location of CCF members than he would with political welfare.

MR. MacDONALD: What has that to do with the issue?

HON. MR. FOOTE: I am charging him with something worse than that. If the hon. member by any conceivable chance was ever Prime Minister of this province, it would be a sad day for the civil servants.

MR. MacDONALD: The civil servants will need a champion pretty soon.

HON. MR. FOOTE: They would get the same treatment the hon. member has given the people in my department.

Nevertheless, I will go on with this case where the Director of Training School reported there was no severity in that treatment.

The second incident concerns a man who was dismissed from the service as a result of striking a boy who sustained a broken jaw. This is the report on him, given to me by Mr. Virgin, Director of Training Schools.

The hon. member has said he was a friend of mine. Of course he was a friend of mine. Friendship and loyalty are great things to have in any organization.

MR. MacDONALD: I agree.

HON. MR. FOOTE: But not so with the hon. member. He seems to be suspicious of that. However, we have enough friends at election times anyway.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister will not have, if he does not clean up the Department of Reform Institutions.

HON. MR. FOOTE: I will "clean" the hon. member up in a minute.

Mr. Virgin said: "This man was highly regarded as a successful boys' worker. In 4½ years he had been promoted to senior supervisor."

On the day of the incident, he was off duty but came back to the school to see if he could be of any assistance to a new supervisor who had just taken over.

MR. MacDONALD: And struck a boy.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Two boys were engaged in a fight and the junior supervisor was unable to stop them. This man stepped in to assist him and slapped one of the boys. The report says that "there was a doubt that the fracture was due to his action" and there seems to be strong possibility that it may have been due to a severe blow struck by the other boy. After all, it was the two boys who were fighting, not the supervisor and the boys. Incidentally, one of my supervisors was in hospital recently with a dislocated jaw inflicted by a boy.

Nevertheless, the man was dismissed and promptly engaged by the Children's Aid Society, who appeared to have no doubt about his worth. I don't see what other action I could have taken, nor could it have been taken more decisively or more promptly.

The hon. member has not been content with the man being dismissed, he has tried to hound him out of his present employment. Would not the hon. member be a good employer of labour! Has he any sympathy for these people? Would he take the whole situation into consideration? It is not in his nature to be kind.

However, since the case of the senior supervisor has received so much publicity, I think it only fair to stress the following facts. This man, by his proven record, was considered by the superintendent as one of his best men. He demonstrated his interest in his job by coming of his own accord—on his own time—to give special assistance.

If he had stayed at home, as he was entitled to, he would not have got into trouble. If he had stood idly by and made no effort to break up the fight, he would have been blamed for doing nothing. He certainly did not leave his

home determined to wreak havoc on anyone. He was simply a victim of extremely bad luck and certainly, I felt sorry for him.

There is no pity in the heart of the hon. member across the way, no consideration for the people who work in our department. I think it is only fair to say this in justice to these men, and I regret very much there may be a possibility of this man's present employment being in danger. He is doing good work in spite of the way in which he has been branded across the whole province.

It seems to me that any one who aspires to be the leader of a Party should be endowed with some sense of fairness and a sense of responsibility. I can offer no guarantee that similar incidents in our department will not occur—nor can anyone else. These incidents are not premeditated and they are not evidences of brutality.

The hon. members of this House will remember that not very long ago there was a case in the courts of this province where a Master who taught at a good private school very near here had punished a boy to the point that when he went home the marks showed upon his body. The Magistrate who heard this case ruled the Master had been within his rights, and it was not brutality. Yet that measure of discipline was no different than what happened here.

Let anything happen in one of our schools and it is taken in quite a different perspective; it is not viewed objectively. It is viewed by people who would use these unfortunate incidents—and to whom the lives of the people concerned mean nothing—for their own political advancement. It is beneath contempt.

MR. MacDONALD: Get down to the issues. I will have to borrow a towel in a moment.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Although I have dealt in detail only with the charges which were brought up, I will tell you that in the 6 years I have been with the department, there have been two other cases of a somewhat similar nature, in

which supervisors were dismissed in an effort to impress on all staff that violence must not be used in dealing with pupils.

In the one case, no injury was done. In the other, a supervisor intervened in a general row among the boys. He picked one boy up bodily—the boy squirmed loose, fell to the ground and broke his wrist.

This man said the way things were going he was afraid that some boy would be seriously hurt, perhaps roll down a stairway and break his back, and he would have been asked why he did not do something about it. This man intervened for that reason, yet this is one of the things the hon. member calls "brutality."

The leader lifted him bodily, the boy wriggled loose and fell, putting out his hand and fracturing a small bone in the wrist.

I cannot feel that this was a case of calculated brutality. It was certainly unfortunate and I took the only course I could and dismissed the man.

I would ask you to remember that distorted presentation of these isolated incidents presents a picture that is by no means in perspective—and obscures the very real achievement that the training schools have to their credit, and the basic approach of kindly, sympathetic understanding that the pupils receive.

On today's log, I see that we have 909 boys and girls in school—and 912 on placements.

|                            | <i>School</i> | <i>Placement</i> |
|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| St. John's (Toronto) ....  | 111           | 166              |
| St. Joseph's (Alfred) .... | 157           | 81               |
| St. Mary's (Downsview) ..  | 124           | 36               |
| O.T.S. (Mercer) .....      | 20            |                  |
| O.T.S. (Cobourg) .....     | 133           | 240              |
| O.T.S. (Bowmanville) ..    | 213           | 296              |
| O.T.S. (Galt) .....        | 125           | 93               |
| O.T.S. (Guelph) .....      | 26            |                  |
|                            | 909           | 912              |
| Total — 1821               |               |                  |

This means that the 912 who have gone through the school are now capable of living in homes—which they were not before—and it means that the schools have succeeded where the homes

and other sources of influence have failed.

Of the 909 in the regular training schools, only 46 have been found to be beyond control and have had to be placed in the special units at the Mercer and Guelph.

We have now called for tenders for two new, entirely separate schools for incorrigibles—one at Galt and one at Guelph. When these are in operation, a great forward step will have been taken in dealing with our most difficult cases.

However, I would remind you that our temporary school section for juveniles at the Mercer has produced a 90 per cent. rehabilitation rate with cases found too difficult for the Galt School, and this can only be attributed to the extraordinary efforts of our superintendent, Mrs. Burrows, and her staff.

MR. MacDONALD: That is a meaningless figure. Anybody in the profession who knows anything about it will not accept that figure.

HON. MR. FOOTE: I do not expect the hon. member to accept anything. I am giving this information to the House, which has proved to be more willing to accept facts than the hon. member.

I have dealt in considerable detail with the charges made against the Boys' School at Cobourg and now I turn to the Girls' School at Galt.

I shall deal with the charges made by the CCF leader, as reported in the *Toronto Telegram* of January 7, 1956. This deals with two specific charges:

1. That recreation has now been virtually eliminated.

2. That an incredibly cruel approach has been made in the case of a girl at Galt.

What are the facts?

I am told the hon. member has never visited the Galt school. I would like to know again who made the statements he has produced? I would like to know who made those statements,



A short time ago the hon. member was on television and was asked, when he made charges against my department, whether he had proof or affidavits. He said, "I have the proof and I will produce it in the proper place, which is in the Legislature."

HON. MR. FROST: He has produced nothing.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He was asked why he did not save his charges until he was in the Legislature and make them then. He said he would produce the proof in the Legislature, but he has produced absolutely nothing today but hearsay evidence, and I am very disappointed in him. He has repeated the charges which I have read, and I will deal with them in some detail.

The first charge was that recreation has been virtually eliminated. What are the facts?

Recreation has not only been continued as formerly, but has been increased. The covered skating rink has been in continuous operation, and on the day I visited there recently, a new shipment was just delivered of figure skating skates and boots of the best quality, better than most children have in their own homes.

I went to the gymnasium where a good class under the direction of a PT instructress was doing excellent work. In addition to that, there are group games which take in every member of the school.

The discussion of the recreational programme showed an all-year programme, as varied and well planned as that of any school available outside.

Let me read to you the extra-curricular programme of activities in the Galt school.

These activities existed at the time the hon. member made his charges. He said that recreation has been virtually eliminated. In addition to the full programme at the school, these activities were going on at the time the charges were made.

#### PROGRAMME—EXTRA-CURRICULAR

2 Hockey Teams—23 girls.

C.G.I.T.—23 girls.

Volleyball—inter-house league. Each house has a team plus subs.

Choir—40 girls.

Cadets—62 girls.

Sewing group—16 girls (1 night).

Arts and crafts (special group)—10 to 15 girls. (Marjory Ernst, B & P Women Wkly.)

Trumpet Band—15 girls. (Scout House Band—Bugler and Hq. Drummer.)

Ice skating nightly.

Baseball—20 girls on two teams, plus a team in each house and an inter-house league.

Movie—One evening weekly.

Special evening programmes once or twice monthly of a musical or educational nature.

One walk off grounds weekly for top house.

Off grounds excursions to Church.

Library—650 books.

Voluntary work groups.

Spec. Wkly. Assembly—flower arr., good grooming, handicrafts, marionettes, etc.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: After hearing that list, many girls throughout Ontario will want to go there.

HON. MR. FOOTE: How can you reconcile this with the tittle-tattle hearsay evidence on which these charges were founded? It smacks of sheer malice and spite on the part of someone. The hon. member is so anxious to interrupt, I ask him, "Were you right or wrong when you said, 'Recreation has been virtually eliminated at the school'?"

MR. MacDONALD: Are there any professional PT people at the school now?

HON. MR. FOOTE: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: When were they engaged and where are they?

HON. MR. FOOTE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will not answer me when I ask him how he can reconcile this with the "tittle-tattle" hearsay evidence on which these charges were founded, so I shall go on.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. Minister thinks I am not answering, I will say let the matter rest and get around to the basic criticisms I made. Do not "tittle-tattle" with marionettes and things like that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Last year, we had a visit from Miss Mellanby, the outstanding woman penologist in Great Britain. She visited the Galt school and has the following to say. Her estimate of the Galt school superintendent is greatly at variance with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for York South:

I have managed to get in visits to Galt and the Mercer, and was extremely glad to see how both are progressing. I was most impressed by Miss Bentley, who is just the type of girl I should choose in an English borstal. That Galt job will always be a tough one, but I would say she was tackling it with the sort of realism and manner that is just what is required.

I wish now to deal at some length with the case of alleged cruelty and mistreatment at Galt. Now remember that at Galt we have 125 girls in the school and 93 on placement. Yet out of all these, *one* case is brought forward. I ask you, why should anyone assume that this one girl should be less kindly treated than all the others about whom nothing has been said? I suggest that it shows a desperate attitude on the part of our critics.

I intend to prove beyond any doubt that this one girl was the subject of more professional care and kindly consideration than any girl ever committed to the Galt school.

The background which preceded commitment is one of deplorable social conditions which I do not feel like outlining to hon. members of the House, but is covered in detail in the evidence submitted before the judge who heard the case. It does include episodes of running away from home and staying away for several days at a time.

On July 20, 1953, this girl was committed at the age of 10 as an incorrigible. She started running away from the school in Nov., 1953, and did so on 9 occasions. She also escaped from the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. The consulting psychiatrist to the school in the report of Nov., 1953, after reviewing the family background and examining the girl, stated in part:

It would be my opinion that the girl's pattern of behaviour is the product of the hopelessly insecure environment.

MR. MacDONALD: You built up her security by throwing her into detention for 92 days.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Get some water and prime the pump.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He further stated that she would have to be observed carefully as to possibility of a future more serious personality disorder.

The first report in April 1954, from the school superintendent states that she is an extremely disturbed girl—the third of her family to be committed to us. Her behaviour is very disrupting at times but is improving slowly.

Now we have the psychiatric report, again from the man who saw her at first.

In July 1954, the psychiatric report said:

We cannot predict a totally good result—although it was suggested on the previous examination that a lengthy period of kindly custodial care would be needed in this case—it would be my opinion that we have reached almost the limitations of the school in serving this function.

This is the professional report on the girl.

MR. MacDONALD: Did he suggest putting her in confinement?

HON. MR. FOOTE: I will repeat the report:

We cannot predict a totally good result—although it was suggested on the previous examination that a lengthy period of kindly custodial care would be needed in this case—it would be my opinion that we have reached almost the limit of the school facilities in fulfilling this function.

MR. MacDONALD: So you put her in confinement for 92 days.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: She was out skating that time.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Just remember that this did not arise in the days when Miss Bentley was there but in the days when Miss McNeil and Miss Barrister were at the school. I want to say—and I am glad to say it—that I do not think we ever had two women in our service who gave more of themselves—

MR. MacDONALD: Hear, hear.

HON. MR. FOOTE: —or finer and better service than Miss McNeil and Miss Barrister.

MR. MacDONALD: And whose approach was unmistakably different.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Yet, in spite of that and in spite of the sympathy for that girl, we have that report. The psychiatrist said: "We cannot predict a totally good result—although it was suggested on the previous examination that a lengthy period of kindly custodial care would be needed in this case—it would be my opinion that we have reached almost the limit of the school facilities in fulfilling this function."

Up to this point the history of this child represents a period prior to the appointment of the present superintendent, so the hon. member's hounding

Miss Bentley seems to have been a little pointless.

At that time consideration was given to possible placement.

On Aug. 23, 1954, a letter from the superintendent of the Children's Aid Society accompanying the inspection report of the home of the child states, "it would be impossible for this child to return home at the present time." The detailed statement again is not one that should be given public release, for the protection of the girl and family.

Further in the letter, the superintendent states: "I feel that this home is not a good one and that the child would certainly not be receiving a suitable example."

This Advisory Board, the hon. members will understand, was a joint ward with the department.

On Sept. 2, 1954, the Advisory Board made the following report:

This girl was committed to Galt School for training, and from reports she is a difficult case, but it would appear that all the school can do at present is to carry on with training in the school.

On Nov. 3, 1954, shortly after Miss Bentley took over the school, she reported to the Children's Aid Society concerned, as follows:

May we review once again the case of the above-named girl, who has since September 1st run away at least 4 times from the school. She has been returned from Bracebridge, Brockville, Toronto and several other local points.

Surely the hon. members of this House will understand the difficulties involved when a girl of that age runs away. You know what the situation would be in the home and how worried the parents would be if the girl, who was already physically a woman, had been permitted to run away time after time, staying away for days, and causing a great deal of worry to Miss Bentley. I am not surprised she decided it would be better if the girl were kept



in at night and locked up so that she could not run away. This seems only common sense. Her report said:

We find this girl a real detriment to the other girls in the school because now she leads runs and takes with her girls who have not run before. She makes promises which she has no intention of keeping, and despite our efforts to arrange a programme especially for her, she continues to be unco-operative in every respect.

The hon. member for York South says there is no individual attention. You can see already that this girl has received a great deal of care and attention. The superintendent, Miss Bentley, endeavoured to arrange a special programme for this one girl out of 125 in that school.

MR. MacDONALD: 92 days' detention.

HON. MR. FOOTE: My friend is very happy when he is sneering at the civil service.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not sneering at the civil service. Come to the issues I have raised, instead of trying to trump up charges like this. You have evaded completely the basic issues I have raised.

MR. MALONEY: Did the hon. member raise any basic issues?

MR. MacDONALD: I did.

MR. MALONEY: I did not hear them.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member says he was raised in the country. There used to be an expression in my home town, where I was raised: "If you burn your posterior, you will have to sit on the blister."

MR. MacDONALD: That is as bright a remark as I would expect.

HON. MR. FROST: You seem to be uneasy.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not uneasy. I am far from uneasy.

HON. MR. FROST: Before we get through, you will find out the truth of that saying.

MR. MacDONALD: Before we get through the session, we will come back to it.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The report by Miss Bentley continues:

On innumerable occasions we have sought psychiatric consultation on her behalf, and we feel that there are no resources to which we can turn. Every attempt at a consistent but firm programme with this girl has been practically to no avail.

This report goes on to enquire of the Children's Aid Society if it would be at all possible to place this child in her own home. Unfortunately, circumstances which arose at that time, made this placement impossible.

On Nov. 23, 1954, the superintendent reported as follows:

This girl made two escapes in the past two weeks—

Certainly she was not in detention when she made those escapes—

and most recently took off in the night having broken all her windows.

On Nov. 25, 1954, there was a recommendation from the Advisory Board that this girl be transferred to The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital for a period of observation.

On Nov. 27, 1954, the consulting psychiatrist again reviewed the case history and stated:

On the basis of these findings it is clinically difficult to concur in the recommendation that the facilities of The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital are suited to the girl's needs. I would find it impossible to certify her as mentally ill.

On Jan. 7, 1955, the Director of Psychiatry agreed with the opinion expressed by the consulting psychiatrist of

the school, that this child could not be certified as mentally ill. Miss Bentley again stressed the disruptive influence of this child on the programme of the school and asked that she again be given some evaluation at The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital.

On Jan. 10, 1955, the Director of Training Schools made representation to The Department of Health, urging that this case be admitted to the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital.

On Jan. 18, 1955, the Assistant Director, Mental Health Division, stated that the problem of the above-named had been referred to the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital and that they had indicated that they would admit her as soon as possible.

On April 12, 1955, this girl was admitted to The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, where she was under observation and investigation for a period of two months, except for the time when she escaped. The report submitted to this department by The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital states in part:

After her admission, the girl was very difficult to keep on the ward, exhibiting noisy rebellious behaviour, using profane language and disturbing other patients. She also tried to run away a few times. In about one to two weeks she improved definitely, after being on a strict regime. . . . her improvement was only temporary and she ran away with another patient on May 16, 1955.

She was apprehended by police in North Bay.

Since then she has been unco-operative, upsetting other patients, tormenting older and very ill persons, being noisy and breaking windows. Psychiatric examination revealed no signs of thought disorder during her entire stay in the hospital. The symptomatology of impulsive anti-social behaviour reflects a serious disturbance in character formation—of the type which is difficult to involve in treatment.

Now, here is what they had to say after two months. Remember, this is one of the finest institutions for such treatment in this country. Listen to this. They say:

The difficulties involved in her treatment preclude the possibility of her staying in this institution any longer.

In other words, they will not have her and will not put up with her any more. They continue:

We would be of the opinion that she would be a behaviour problem in any setting, whether in hospital, training school or the community.

We would suggest that any planned management would consider the need of providing supervision for this girl, preferably in a controlled setting. It is our feeling that the prognosis with respect to improvement in adjustment in the immediate future is poor.

On June 10, 1955, the Advisory Board reviewed 3 possibilities: sending the girl to her own home, to the training school section of the Mercer, or returning her to Galt. Because of her age, which has been mentioned here, the board recommended that she be tried again at the Galt school, where, in accordance with the advice of The Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, she was placed in a controlled setting.

MR. MacDONALD: In detention.

HON. MR. FOOTE: On June 24, 1955, our psychiatric consultant at Galt reported as follows:

Since her return from the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, this child has continued to demonstrate the same type of periodical behaviour disorder as prior to her admission. Approximately a week ago when attempts were made to discipline her actions, she was very assaultive to the superintendent.

This word "assaultive" may be understood more clearly, or illustrated better, when I tell you that this girl, along with

two similar cases from St. Mary's Training School, took scissors from the sewing room and attacked the matrons at the Mercer.

They were trying to strike them in the face with pointed scissors—

One of them actually bit a chunk of flesh out of a matron's arm. Indeed if the girls had not been disarmed with the assistance of other inmates, I think the matrons would have been in danger of their lives.

MR. MacDONALD: Is this the same girl or another case? The hon. Minister is mixing cases.

HON. MR. FOOTE: This girl was one of those in the institution.

MR. MacDONALD: Was it she who used the scissors?

HON. MR. FOOTE: The consultant's report continues:

Since this time she has been maintained in the detention quarters.

If any one cares to read about the number of conferences this girl had had with psychiatrists, psychologists and others, and the number of efforts that have been made on her behalf they may do so. In addition, the chief psychiatrist of the department was at that time well aware of the situation.

MR. MacDONALD: What about the treatment she received afterwards?

HON. MR. FOOTE: At this time it was appreciated by all concerned that the close restriction of this girl was undesirable but preferable to any other course of action, which not only would disrupt the training school but would permit the girl to escape again.

On July 15, 1955, she was under the supervision of the consulting psychiatrist to the school. His report of July 15 describes the medicine he has prescribed and he states that:

On examination she is quite co-operative. States that she has been feeling much better in the last two

weeks, during this time feeling more settled and apparently has been functioning adequately as a kitchen helper.

MR. MacDONALD: He did not put her in detention. That is the difference.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The superintendent reported on August 22, 1955:

Since shortly after this girl's return from the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, she has been living in detention. She was placed in the kitchen to work during the day—listen to that—and returned to detention each evening.

MR. MacDONALD: This is the latter part of the 92 days.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The report continues:

The hope was to increase her participation in the school programme. She gets books from our library and has been taking first one, then two swimming periods a week. She has been quite unable to earn the third swimming and the movie.

MR. MacDONALD: So she was treated so well that she tried to commit suicide.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The superintendent's report continues:

She has not worked an entire week in the kitchen either without a blow-up necessitating return to detention quarters, or the symptoms of one, which necessitates her being left there for a day or two.

This report covers a part of the time when she was in detention, but shows that detention was not continuous and that every effort was made to avoid it.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I want to say that this headline was read by the CCF leader as though he attributed it to Miss Bentley, but she did not write the headlines and he knows it. What she did say was printed down further and pointed out that the girl was not in continuous detention but came out during the daytime to do certain things.



MR. MacDONALD: Not throughout the whole 92 days. The hon. Minister is evading the point.

HON. MR. FOOTE: You would not read this, so I will read it, to show what she has been doing in detention, the sports in which she engaged and all the rest of it.

The report continues:

The consulting psychiatrist urged that she be tried outside of detention on every possible occasion, which was done.

But it will be noted that on Sept. 4 she escaped and was returned to the school on Sept. 6.

MR. MacDONALD: Back to the detention again.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The superintendent's report to the Director of Training Schools concludes with the following:

If the department or the Advisory Board have any directives on this case, could we please have them.

MR. MALONEY: Send her to the hon. member for York South.

HON. MR. FOOTE: On Aug. 25, 1955, the Advisory Board reviewed the case and stated that they had no further suggestions to offer at that time.

On Sept. 7, 1955, the superintendent reported (a day after her return from escaping) that this girl has been confined to the detention quarters because she had been blowing up into another episode.

Provided that during this week-end period she was co-operative in detention, she was allowed to go swimming and attend the movie on Sept. 4. On the return from the movie to the house, that is, during part of that time in detention, she ran away and there followed two days of upset and fighting in Nelson House because of the rumours of those who were to accompany her. On her return to Galt she was placed in detention for her own protection.

On Sept. 26, 1955, she was again examined by the consulting psychiatrist.

The hon. member has said that he hardly ever saw her. I say that he hardly ever seemed to have her out of his sight.

MR. MacDONALD: It was only once a week. He has 120 to look after.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Will the hon. member give me an opportunity to put this on *Hansard*?

MR. MacDONALD: I will give the hon. Minister the same opportunity I had.

MR. WARDROPE: He did not interrupt you once. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. FOOTE: Is the hon. member for York South not pretty well satisfied by now, without the rest of this?

MR. MALONEY: Go on.

MR. MacDONALD: Does the hon. Minister want me to start again? He is providing enough evidence for another speech.

HON. MR. FOOTE: This is the part I would like hon. members to note.

On September 26, 1955, she was again examined by the consulting psychiatrist of the school who deplored the fact that she had to be kept so much in detention, but points out that:

As long as the girl remains in the Galt school it appears necessary to maintain her in the detention quarters.

I will read again what the hon. member said as reported in the *Toronto Telegram*:

Beyond a doubt this action (detention) was taken without the supporting recommendation of the consulting psychiatrist.

That is what the hon. member said, "beyond a doubt," and he said it again today, that this action was taken without the supporting recommendation of the consulting psychiatrist.

MR. MacDONALD: After months of driving her to distraction surely you had to do something at this stage. When she got to Mercer she was happy, under conditions which are supposed to be for adults and hardened criminals. You cannot face the force of that contrast. You are evading it.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon member said that the action was taken without the supporting recommendation of the consulting psychiatrist. Let him read the report from the consulting psychiatrist:

As long as the girl remains in the Galt school it appears necessary to maintain her in the detention quarters.

MR. MacDONALD: It was at the end of the 92 days of confinement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MALONEY: Name the member.

MR. SPEAKER: If you do not mind, I will interrupt, to say that we will not have arguments across the floor of the House.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon member wants to talk so loudly so that no one will hear this statement, which is a contradiction of his, with proof.

MR. MacDONALD: It is not a contradiction.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon member says this was done without advice—and I have quoted the psychiatrist's report.

MR. MacDONALD: For the third time, I say that this report came at the end of the 92 days, and not at the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: This is the fourth time. It will not change the facts.

HON. MR. FOOTE: May I put some of this on the record, without reading it? There is part of this I would like to pass to *Hansard*, without reading it.

I have now established beyond doubt that the hon. member for York South is absolutely wrong in his statement and that detention was advised as long as the girl remained at Galt, not only by one psychiatrist, but by two. And now, the Hon. member for York South has a question on the Order paper about the length of time spent in detention, which it will now be conceded was necessary.

From Oct., 1954 to Dec., 1954, there were 5 periods of confinement of 1, 6, 7, 8 and 14 days.

From Jan., 1955 to April, 1955, there was a period of 92 days in which she was in and out of detention. During that time, she spent half of her time out—taking part in the normal programme of the school. The superintendent is very positive in this statement. She then spent two months in Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. From June 17 to Sept. 4 she slept in detention to prevent her running away, but she was out of detention more than she was in.

During the daytime, she worked in the kitchen, and also took part in swimming, picnics, walks, etc.

The consulting psychiatrist further stated that, in spite of the above, further confinement might contribute to a more serious personality disorder. Accordingly, the case was again reviewed by our psychiatrists and by the Advisory Board, who felt that there were 3 choices: to send her back to her home, to keep her in the Galt school, or to send her to the Training School Section of the Mercer—the procedure that in view of her age had been deferred until it became, in the opinion of the above, the last resort.

On Oct. 8, 1955, she was moved to the training school section of the Mercer. At the same time, two girls were also moved from St. Mary's Training School on the urgent request of the Mother Superior.

After her first period of time in the Mercer, she seemed to be improving and the prognosis looked hopeful. However, after 5 weeks she reverted to her former behaviour pattern and in order to escape from an environment which she disliked, swallowed a pin, and was taken to the Sick Children's Hospital for its removal.

While at the Mercer she has been examined by the consulting psychiatrist of that institution. She is now under the supervision of Dr. Boothroyd and pending further disposition.

The chief psychiatrist sees no alternative to keeping her at the Mercer until the new institution for girls is completed. It may be that some type of employment and training can be given which would help her to earn a living when she ceases to be a ward of the state. Here she is under the direction of the psychiatrist of the school.

I come down now to the final point. The hon. member says that there has been no individual attention. I went down on 3 different nights so that I could have a talk with her myself and see what I could do. Dr. Brancale, director of the Menlo Park Diagnostic Centre in New Jersey, was in the city some time ago. I engaged him to go down and see her and give me his opinion of this girl. We talked over the whole problem. He gave some advice, but he said that this girl, in her eruptive moods, must be kept in detention, for her own protection, until she quiets down.

I say that this girl has one very simple thing to do to get herself out of detention. All she has to say are three words: "I will behave." That is all. If she says those words she can walk out at any time. I think the hon. member opposite would permit her freedom, so she could roam the streets.

MR. MacDONALD: I made no such suggestion. She has to say, "I will behave," when you have had her for 92 days.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He does not care what happens to the girl.

Further to this, she was seen at my request by Dr. Brancale, Director of the Menlo Park Diagnostic Centre in New Jersey, who stated again, that in her eruptive moods, she must be kept in detention. This consultation with the outstanding doctor in this specialized field, added to the treatment she had already received from our own doctors and the Toronto Psychiatric, surely disposes of the charge that there was any neglect.

I think that the facts I have presented should persuade any reasonable person that the charges which have been made against my department are vicious, malicious, distorted and unfair. I think they should call for a retraction and apology from the leader of the CCF Party.

Part of his solution consists in firing people right and left. That is not the way of this government.

MR. MacDONALD: When did I say that?

HON. MR. FOOTE: What about the remarks the hon. member made about my Deputy Minister, about the director of the training school, about the doctors and supervisors?

MR. MacDONALD: What doctors?

HON. MR. FOOTE: A psychiatrist.

MR. MALONEY: Does the hon. member want to read what he said?

MR. MacDONALD: I know what I said.

HON. MR. FOOTE: We feel that our loyal and faithful civil servants are entitled to the support of their Ministers, and to job security. They cannot be condemned and fired on hearsay distorted evidence. The hon. member from York South condemns my deputy, the director of training schools, my superintendents, my psychiatrists and others. I tell the truth about them, and that truth is their justification and their defense.



The hon. member for York South sets himself up as an authority on penology, and damns both the professional men and others who have spent years in this work. He sneers at those who have had a long and distinguished career in the services and makes it appear as anything but a credit to have been associated with the Armed Forces.

MR. MacDONALD: May I interrupt on a point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: I object on a point of privilege. I have not criticized anybody because of their association with the Armed Forces; in fact, I am a member of the Legion.

I am criticizing them for basic military-mindedness, which has no place in our Department of Reform Institutions. It is a 19th-century philosophy. There is a subtle distinction which I am convinced is not too subtle for the hon. Prime Minister to grasp although the hon. Minister does not seem to understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. Carry on with the debate.

HON. MR. FOOTE: He has little if any sense of fairness in dealing with civil servants.

I must say, in fairness to the hon. member from York South, that he has admitted that we have made some headway and quotes the clinic for the treatment of alcohol addiction, and the second clinic for the treatment of drug addiction, but he spoils his faint praise by adding that these institutions are used as a front to hide a very backward general policy.

Why does he not add to our achievements several other Ontario firsts?

Why ignore the new Mental Health Centre at the Mercer? The very complete Mental Health Centre at Guelph? The building of a \$2 million Psychopathic Treatment Centre at Millbrook?

The new Training Centre for young men at Burtch? The new institution at Brampton which will offer to a selected group of women from the Mercer, what the well established Brampton institution now provides for men? The new institution for incorrigible girls at Galt? The new institution for incorrigible boys at Guelph? The projected unit at Mimico for the accommodation of old men? The study of the sex offender, as a high level research project under the direction of a psychiatrist, psychologists and social worker in close touch with the University of Toronto?

Would not the inclusion of these projects round out the picture and give the public a better perspective of our work? It would! But that is not the intention of the CCF leader.

MR. MacDONALD: Back to a personal attack.

HON. MR. FOOTE: What has the hon. member been doing all day? He has not been attacking me, but the members of my department, and he has tried to get out of it by saying, "The Minister is a good man, I have confidence in him." I say I take full responsibility for my department.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister has evaded the basic criticism I made throughout my entire speech.

HON. MR. FOOTE: I stand up for my men. The hon. member will never be a Minister in this House. He has no loyalty to his men at all, and it would be a sad day if he were ever a Minister.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are not moving too slowly in reform institutions. There is grave danger that we are moving too quickly, in advance of the adequate supply of professional staff. You may say that if we outbid all other departments of government, and all social agencies, we would get what we wanted. I daresay we would—but that would hardly improve the position of the others.

I have not noticed any abatement in the demand for highways, welfare

services, health, or education, nor will there be.

I have every confidence that the Provincial Treasurer, and my colleagues will support the position of my department to the limit of the resources available, and that is all that can be asked of them.

Already we are leaders in the field in this Dominion and the time is within sight when no jurisdiction anywhere will be able to offer a more complete programme of rehabilitative treatment in every branch of our work.

Mr. W. Murdoch (Essex South) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Tomorrow we will proceed with some of the items on the Order paper and also with the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 6.35 of the clock p.m.



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Friday, February 10, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Friday, February 10, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act, 1953, Bill to amend, first reading,<br>Mr. Cathcart ..... | 167 |
| Land Surveyors Act, Bill to amend, first reading, Mr. Mapledoram .....                                      | 167 |
| Re letter written by Dr. van Nostrand, Mr. MacDonald .....  | 168 |
| Presentation of reports, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 174 |
| Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Boyer ..                               | 174 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, agreed to, Mr. Cowling .....  | 182 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 182 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1956

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

### THE LAND SURVEYORS ACT

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC SITES PROTECTION ACT, 1953

Hon. B. L. Cathcart moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Has the hon. Minister any reasons why we should accept this Bill?

HON. MR. CATHCART: I will be glad to give the reason for the Bill. It is simply to increase the membership of the Archaeological Committee from 7 to 9 members. It is felt that there are many persons in this field who are well qualified to assist in advice and counsel in relation to historical sites. We would like to take advantage of their availability with the hope that we may have a better distribution of them across the province.

Hon C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This is the first change in The Land Surveyors Act for about 60 years.

Sections 1, 2, 4(3), and 9: section 9(1) of the Act, repealed by section 2 of the Bill, fixes the time and place of the annual meetings of The Association of Land Surveyors of Ontario. Section 29(1) of the Act, repealed by section 8 of the Bill, prescribes the fees that are payable by members as well as fees for examinations.

Hereafter the first two of these matters will be dealt with in the by-laws of the association (section 1 of the Bill) and the third by the council of the Association (section 4(3) of the Bill).

Section 3: this amendment removes the minimum and maximum fee that may be paid to members of the board of examiners for attending at examinations and leaves the amount of such fee to be fixed by by-law of the association.

Section 4: subsection 1. This amendment increases the period of apprenticeship from 3 to 4 years and requires two of those years to be spent in the field.

Subsection 2: self-explanatory.

Subsection 3: The new subsections deal with examinations of candidates for a surveyor's certificate.

Section 5: the terminology of the section is brought up-to-date and the

standard is raised to that required for admission to a course in civil engineering.

Section 6: the term of apprenticeship for graduate students is increased from one to two years, one of which must be spent in the field.

Clause *aa* is new and is self-explanatory.

Section 7: self-explanatory.

Section 8: the provision repealed deals with fees which are now dealt with in clause *ccc* of section 8(1) and section 21(5) of the Act. See sections 1 and 4(3) of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will be referred to the committee and all hon. members of the House will have an opportunity to ask questions and examine it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I rise on a question of privilege.

Yesterday I received a letter which I would have included, perhaps, in my remarks in the afternoon, if I could have decided exactly what should have been done with the document. It was a letter sent to me by Dr. van Nostrand, whom this House will recognize as the Director of Neurology and Psychiatry in The Department of Reform Institutions.

The history of the letter is briefly this. He sent it to the *Globe and Mail* and the *Globe and Mail* returned it stating it was too long and suggesting that certain passages should be deleted, for reasons I will indicate in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this letter should become public property—not in any abbreviated form, to which Dr. van Nostrand might be forced to reduce it because of the greater sense of propriety on the part of the editors of the *Globe and Mail*. Therefore, I am tabling this letter and if it is within the rules of the House, I would ask that it be reprinted *in toto* in *Hansard*.

My question of privilege arises out of this letter; I shall not read the whole letter. You can read it for yourself,

Mr. Speaker, unless the House wants it read at this point. This letter purports to be, in very facetious terms, a psychiatric appraisal of myself.

HON. MEMBERS: Read the letter.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I do not know that there is any question of privilege about this.

MR. MacDONALD: There is a question of privilege.

HON. MR. FROST: If he wants to table the letter, why not? Is there any question of privilege?

MR. MacDONALD: There is.

HON. MR. FROST: What is the question of privilege?

MR. MacDONALD: I was just about to state it, but you asked me to read the letter.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Let us have the question of privilege.

MR. MacDONALD: The question of privilege is that this letter is a vicious personal attack upon me, as a member of this House. It purports, in facetious terms, to give a psychiatric appraisal of myself.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Is he capable of doing that?

MR. MacDONALD: The inference is that my action in regard to The Department of Reform Institutions at the present time is based on a great sense of guilt because of my failure to do my duty before and during the war.

HON. MEMBERS: Read the letter.

MR. MacDONALD: I will read it if you wish, but I have been asked to state the question of privilege. Now, what do you want me to do?

HON. MR. FROST: This is a private matter.



MR. MacDONALD: A personal attack has been made by a civil servant.

HON. MR. FROST: When did you receive the letter?

MR. MacDONALD: I got it yesterday.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is a private letter.

MR. MacDONALD: It is not. It was sent to the *Globe and Mail*, which sent it back. Dr. van Nostrand sent it to me and asked me if I would substantiate certain things. It was kind of him to do that, but it was only after having it returned by the *Globe and Mail* to which it was sent for printing without any reference to me at all.

MR. T. L. KENNEDY: No one knows about that. I do not think it is a matter of privilege at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Since the hon. member thinks it is a personal attack, there is a question of privilege.

MR. MacDONALD: When hon. members have had a chance to read this letter themselves—or I have had a chance to read it before the House—hon. members will see that it is a direct, vicious and extraneous personal attack upon me and my actions, while I was in the service during the war. Do you want the letter?

HON. MEMBERS: Read the letter.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I have received dozens of them in my experience.

MR. MacDONALD: But the hon. Provincial Secretary did not get one from the head of The Department of Psychiatry.

We will see if it is a personal attack, and perhaps we will let the public see.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS: To whom is it addressed?

MR. MacDONALD: It was addressed to the editor of the *Globe and Mail* in the first instance, and that man, having a greater sense of propriety,

sent it back for expurgation. It is going to be sent back for publication, and it will be published in the expurgated form. My suggestion is that it should be published in the original. It reads:

About a month ago, when Mr. Donald MacDonald, leader of the CCF Party in Ontario, began his attack on The Department of Reform Institutions, he was reported in the Press to have made derogatory remarks about "the military mindedness of the top brass" in the department. A large number of the staff of the department are ex-service personnel—after all, in the Civil Service, both federal and provincial, preference is given to veterans who have had overseas service.

As Mr. MacDonald developed his attack, the same theme kept recurring with monotonous familiarity, even being included in his criticism of the Galt Training School for Girls, which certainly is not operated by ex-service personnel, yet the terms "spit and polish," "Colonel's," "regimentation," etc. appeared in a Press report of January 7, 1956.

No action by me appeared to be indicated until the *Globe and Mail*, in its issue of January 25, 1956, published an article under the heading:

#### CCF LEADER SAYS FOOTE STATEMENT WINDOW DRESSING

The opening paragraph of this article states "Troubles in the Reform Institutions Department are the result of a severe case of schizophrenia in its leadership, Donald MacDonald, CCF leader, charged in a statement yesterday." In the body of the article, the following appears: "but the dominating personality" he continued "is a relentlessly consistent exponent of the old punitive, almost purely custodial, approach to penal reform.

"He did not name the official."

This brought the matter to my official attention, as by my terms of reference, I advise the Minister of Reform Institutions in all matters pertaining to the psychiatric welfare of staff as well as inmates.

It has taken some time to make an appraisal of the mental status of the senior departmental officials, but since January 25, this has been done. I have examined "the colonels"; two lieut.-colonels, two majors, one former sgt. major and various odds and sods who had overseas service in the Navy and Air Force. I am now prepared to certify that none of the "top brass" is suffering from schizophrenia, and would give evidence to this effect before a "judicial inquiry," which has been suggested in the Press. There is, however, one case of paranoia, and possibly two, on the head office staff.

In fairness, it was necessary to submit myself to a professional colleague for appraisal, and I find that I am definitely paranoid. This was not a great surprise, as previous appraisal 20 years ago revealed paranoid tendencies. However, with advancing years and stress, it has apparently become worse. Naturally, I have re-read the standard textbooks regarding paranoia.

Coleman, page 273, states:

"Paranoid patients are not always as dangerous as we have been led to believe by popular fiction and drama, but there is always a chance that they will decide to take matters in their own hands and deal with their enemies in the only way that seems effective."

Coleman goes on to cite some rather lurid examples of the type of action that paranoids may take. My medical-legal adviser has stated that it is often impossible to commit paranoid patients, either to mental hospitals, or prisons, until tragedy has occurred.

Finding that Mr. MacDonald's charge of schizophrenia could not be substantiated, I became interested in his personality deviation. Inquiry at the Legislative Library, Queen's Park, revealed very little, but I was referred to the *Globe and Mail* issue of Monday, November 23, 1953—

Perhaps when I reach the end of this letter, your laughter will take on a different tone.

MR. OLIVER: Let them laugh while they can.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right, they should laugh while they can.

—which was published just after his appointment as leader of the CCF Party in Ontario. From this it appears that he is now 42 years of age; was reared on a farm; decided to enter public life while still in high school—

HON. MR. DALEY: Is this what the hon. member wanted to place on the record?

MR. MacDONALD: I did not want to read it; I wanted to table it, so that hon. members could read it in the silence of the evening.

HON. MR. DALEY: The hon. member wanted to read it to prove he was born on a farm.

MR. MacDONALD: This continues:

—taught school for 5 years while taking a course of history studies from Queens University; gave up teaching to complete his studies and achieved a Master's Degree from Queens. Following an extensive European and Canadian speaking tour, he was a reporter on a Montreal paper.

The Press report continues—Mr. Donald MacDonald enlisted in the Navy in 1942—

From this point on, I draw the attention of the hon. members to the slanderous innuendoes which appear.

—(the date is not stated), was later commissioned and stationed at Ottawa in Wireless Intelligence. Following discharge from the service, he made the CCF his career.

The above biographical sketch is meagre and MacDonald may be a modest man, but if we accept the above report as being reasonably accurate, his age was 26 in 1939. During the first part of the war, he apparently did not let any "military

mindfulness" interfere with his own interests, but continued to fit himself for his life's work.

He enlisted ahead of the draft.

HON. MR. NICKLE: "Beating the gun," as it were.

MR. MacDONALD: The letter continues:

He was commissioned and was stationed at Ottawa in the Wireless Intelligence Section. The biography does not give his date of discharge, or what rank he attained. It is not safe to assume that he served only on the HMS *Pinafore*—

Yes, let those on the Treasury benches laugh! There were about 2,000 people who were commissioned to do duty on the so-called HMS *Pinafore* and did it well during the war. Here we have laughter from people who pretend to know so much about the service.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Read the letter.

MR. MacDONALD: I will read it. I am interrupted by the laughter—and its significance.

—or other warships operating out of the port of Ottawa. He may have served at sea on a fighting ship.

Could it be that Mr. MacDonald's reactions arise from a sense of guilt? You are reminded that, by the summer of 1942, many Canadian servicemen had lost their lives at sea, in the air over Britain, and the Continent, and at Dieppe.

Many of the Canadian soldiers called up and trained under the NRMA later gave excellent service. Some of the so-called "Zombies" who went overseas, however, did not do well; they "folded up" under the stress of service, and were brought to my attention for disposal. With few exceptions, these showed resentment toward authority and regimentation and toward "militarism" in any form.

I have tentatively diagnosed Mr. MacDonald's condition as one of

obsessive-compulsive behaviour. In this regard, Coleman states:

"Obsessive reactions may grow out of feelings of guilt and self-condemnation over ethically unacceptable desires, or forbidden behaviour. Obsessive reactions may be the only way the patient can protect himself from a dangerous and threatening world." —Compulsive behaviour—"The performance of the compulsive act usually brings a feeling of satisfaction, whereas if he tries to refrain from the compulsion, he is overcome by a feeling of anxiety and tension."

This reads like some of the descriptions given by the hon. Attorney-General when he is bringing in some amendments to legal Bills. It is difficult to grasp, I agree.

"Obsessive compulsive patients sometimes wash themselves as often as 50 times per day, in an effort to get rid of their sense of pollution and guilt."

Presumably I am guilty because I had not done my duty in the war.

"Others wash dirty linen in public, and continue to wash it when no useful purpose can be served."

Search of the literature yields little hope for the Department of Reform Institutions — obsessive-compulsives may suicide, but this is very unusual. Geldengruber attributes this to their being "self-protective."

Let me assure the Doctor I shall not commit suicide.

Mr. MacDonald may have been reticent in his Press release of November, 1953, although he has shown no inhibitions whatever in his recent releases. If Mr. MacDonald served continuously for a full year in an actual theatre of war in any of the services, I will, of course, have to discard my theory and, with the assistance of an unbiased colleague, begin the appraisal over again. There is certainly some deep-seated aberration here—who knows, it might be schizophrenia.



Some of the statements which have appeared in the Press are without any basis of fact whatever. Some are founded on fact, but have been so warped and twisted in the telling, that they are barely recognizable. Some are damaging to the reputations of professional people, whose work is directed by me. This I am quite prepared to prove in a court of law, or before a judiciary committee, if such is set up by the Provincial Government.

Never having met Mr. MacDonald, the above diagnosis is still a tentative one. Confirmation must await further evidence of abnormal behaviour. However, the diagnosis of obsessive-compulsive behaviour has been made on exactly the same evidence—newspaper reports and hearsay evidence—on which Mr. MacDonald has based his diagnosis of “schizophrenia” in The Department of Reform Institutions, when he entered the field of psychiatry.

Incidentally, that is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. The letter continues:

This discussion should not continue to clutter up the Press. However, if anyone wishes to obtain a more serious appraisal of the character of this young politician, it will be sent free of charge to anyone sending a stamped self-addressed envelope to the undersigned.

Mr. Speaker, to the government this appears to be highly amusing. It obviously has some amusing overtones, if you want to get away from the fact that once again he does not answer any of the charges I made; and, what is more important, in the course of the letter he makes a vicious attack upon myself in connection with my war record, which I suggest is a completely extraneous issue. He even drags in terms of “zombies” and “conscription,” the one political issue which has torn this nation many times.

I would like to state, since my war record has been raised, and since Dr. van Nostrand was going to publish the

letter without knowing the facts, that I spent over 4 years in the Navy. I joined the Navy as an Ordinary Seaman. Because of my eyes, that was the only way I could get to sea. I would have gone into the fighting lines as I hoped and intended to do, because, as hon. members of this House will find out, I never run away from a battle on any occasion.

After training as an Ordinary Seaman for wireless and within 5 weeks of being sent to sea on some mission—whatever it might have been—I was commissioned and sent to Ottawa on what I would like to suggest to the House was a pretty important task in view of the type of warfare we faced. I was one of the co-ordinating group drawing together the Directors of Intelligence of the Army, Navy and Air Force, and the Directors of Signals of each of those branches. I was a member of that team which for years did more than any other single group to save our men in the submarine warfare in the North Atlantic Ocean.

I was not on the battlefields, because I was not ordered to go there, but was in the Battle of the Atlantic; in terms of time and contact in connection with my job, I was not more than seconds away from it. Many Canadian boys were saved because of the activities of that group. If a submarine raised its periscope above the water, we knew it, and the submarine was set upon by an aeroplane or warship which was sent there.

It was not my dictate; it was the dictate of the “Powers-that-Be” that I did that job, and I do not feel ashamed of it. I resent strongly such slurs from a man who is in a Civil Service position in The Department of Reform Institutions and who adopts this kind of attack in connection with the criticisms which I had made of the department.

In conclusion, I would like to say that at the outset I was of the opinion that the branch of the department which had been set up under Doctor van Nostrand—who was chosen after he retired from Sunnybrook Hospital—was one of the branches in The Department of Reform

Institutions which raised our hopes to the full. I now have serious doubts as to whether that is the case. The whole situation should be re-appraised.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Is that going on *Hansard*? I would like to know if the letter is going to be placed on *Hansard*. Because of my responsibility regarding revenues from *Hansard*, I am sure we would sell a great number of copies, if people knew this would be in it.

MR. MacDONALD: It is time this government dealt with this seriously, rather than facetiously.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The people would like to read that letter.

MR. MacDONALD: They would come to some conclusions regarding The Department of Reform Institutions.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised at the course the hon. member has taken. I have always found in public life that it is wise to have a sense of the proportion of things, and a sense of humour. I think those are very desirable.

Here is the situation as I see it. The person in question sent this letter, as I understand it, to one of the newspapers. I think the newspaper was quite right in returning the letter. Obviously the letter was written in a moment of extreme aggravation caused by references to the "military mind" and "19th century setting" which apparently he thought was directed to himself, and, therefore, was apparently highly agitated.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, are the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister directed towards me or towards Doctor van Nostrand? They have a very direct application to him.

HON. MR. FROST: I am commenting on the situation in an impartial way, as I see it.

After the letter was returned to him, I gather he sent the letter to the hon. member?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, with a covering letter which is equally facetious.

HON. MR. FROST: When he sent the letter to the hon. member, it became a private matter. I doubt the wisdom of bringing up such a matter in this House. The hon. member, of course, has a perfect right, under the provisions of the rules of the House, to raise the matter, but whether it is wise is another question.

What the hon. member said was apparently taken as a personal affront by Doctor van Nostrand. It is of his own volition that the hon. member raises the matter here.

I would think it is a matter for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I question the advisability—even under stress or aggravation—of a civil servant writing such a letter. I agree with the hon. member's point of view in that regard. On the other hand, a matter of this sort could perhaps have been dealt with more properly by the hon. member if he had come to me or the hon. Minister. In bringing it out into the open in this way, he has adopted a course which was open to him but whether it was wise is another thing.

Mr. Speaker, I will discuss this with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, and perhaps with the gentleman in question to direct that he exercise more discretion in the future.

I have known of cases where civil servants have felt they have been aggrieved, and have come to me because of things which have been said which have appeared to reflect on them. I have always endeavoured to compose such things. I have always endeavoured to refrain from casting reflections upon civil servants who, I think, are bound by the ordinary procedure not to reply. I imagine sometimes some of them find it difficult and feel that personal reflections have been cast upon them.

I have had such cases in the last few years. It is far wiser for civil servants who feel they have been aggrieved to take the question up with their hon. Minister or with me, and discuss matters

of that sort in a private way, rather than making it a public issue.

These are difficult matters for they involve human personalities. There is the fact of their own feelings to consider, as well as those in the case of the hon. member.

I would like to say to the hon. member that many things are said of people in public life. I would like to show the hon. member some of the letters I have received; some of them are really masterpieces. However, in such matters, you have to keep a sense of balance, and retain a proper sense of humour. If I were easily offended, I would be offended all the time, and I know the hon. members opposite, who have been in this House longer than I, feel the same way.

MR. MacDONALD: I hope I have the balance, but I suggest this letter has more significance than that.

HON. MR. FROST: I will read it more carefully later. Some of the words in it are a little over my head.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member will learn as time goes on, that you must expect these verbal blasts, and these criticisms.

However, there is a point which cannot escape me, and which I know did not escape the hon. Prime Minister, which was that in this instance you have a civil servant of this province writing the type of letter which has been written, and has been read this afternoon by the hon. member for York South.

I think we should take more than passing notice of this instance, because to me, it is completely outside the jurisdiction, shall I say, of a civil servant.

Now, it may be true—as it undoubtedly is—that from time to time civil servants get pretty well “fed up” with certain situations and certain criticisms. But the out-pouring of that should be through the hon. Minister of the Department, and certainly not through the civil servant in question.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested, he should certainly talk this matter over with the hon. Minister in charge, because the civil servant in this instance, in my judgment, went far afield, and almost completely out of the field in which he was engaged.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming 40 members of the Western Technical Commercial School of this city.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. Report of the Minister of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ended March 31, 1955.

2. Report of the Minister of Agriculture respecting the co-operative marketing loans made under The Co-operative Marketing Loan Act, for the year ended December 31, 1955.

3. Report of the Statistical Branch of The Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ended December 31, 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

## THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, as I sat in this House on opening day last week, a wonderful feeling came over me, a feeling which I must confess has come over me almost every time I have heard the Speech from the Throne. Because it seemed to me, as I listened, that I heard not just the forecast of proposed government legislation, not merely a forecast of proposed government policy, but, indeed, a preview of the history of Ontario in the years which lie ahead, a preview, the details of which will be filled in, in the weeks to come, a preview of things which will be fulfilled in the days which are to follow.

This process is not a new phenomenon because, and I think all hon.



members will agree, every Speech from the Throne in the past decade has been a preview of the Province of Ontario to come. Indeed, I feel that if a visitor to this province from a far-distant land were to read the Speeches from the Throne for the last 10 years, he would have seen a history of the Province of Ontario during those 10 years. And people of Ontario whom he might meet on the outside after his reading would vouch for the fact that what he had read was a dynamic history of 10 years.

So, unlike the hon. leader of the Opposition, I can congratulate the author of the Speech from the Throne, and those who inspired his words.

I listened in the House to a reference which the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie made in reference to the hon. Prime Minister. I also heard the hon. leader of the Opposition, in commenting on that reference, state that he had never heard a eulogy more profuse and more eloquent. But the hon. leader of the Opposition omitted to add the words which I think the vast majority of the hon. members of this House—and, indeed, the people throughout the length and breadth of Ontario—would add, that never was a eulogy more deserved.

I am proud to be a supporter of the hon. Prime Minister and his administration, for many reasons, some of which have been cited in the Speech from the Throne, to which I have already made reference. One of the great principles to which reference was made in the Speech from the Throne, and, in fact, in other Speeches from the Throne is the principle of human betterment. The hon. leader of the CCF Party may scoff at that programme of human betterment, as introduced into this province, but I for one, am proud to be associated with every aspect of it.

MR. MacDONALD: It is a good principle, Mr. Speaker, if it was fulfilled.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, it has been fulfilled.

I will not deal with all aspects of that programme, as it is familiar to all hon. members of this House, and, indeed,

familiar to the people of Ontario who have endorsed it. But there is one phase upon which I would like to say a few words. I promised certain constituents in my riding that I would refer to it, and I never make a promise lightly. It is in reference to assistance to the aged.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members are familiar with the provisions of The Old-Age Assistance Act in Ontario, by which this province shares on an equal basis with the Federal Government assistance given to those in need between the ages of 65 and 69, up to a maximum of \$40. I would like to stress that it is not the Government of Ontario which has decided the standard of living to which these aged people are entitled; it is the Ottawa government which was the initial judge as to what is required by the aged in that group upon which to live.

This province has gone on record time and time again as saying that if the Federal Government should see fit—and I urge them to see fit—that the minimum standard of living should be raised, this province would be most willing to share on an equal basis in the increase.

It has even been suggested there be an alternative way—which I most heartily endorse—and that is raising the maximum income which those eligible for old-age assistance may receive, and yet still qualify for the old-age assistance. Neither of those, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, has been fulfilled. But I do urge the hon. Minister of Welfare—whom I congratulate upon his appointment—to continue to press at Ottawa for some measure to raise this minimum standard which has been put forward for those entitled to receive old-age assistance. But, Mr. Speaker, can we wait? I say we cannot. We have not waited in the past in regard to certain things. We should not wait, I feel, too long into the future.

Since 1952, this province has shared with the municipalities the payment of a supplementary old-age assistance, to a maximum amount of \$10. I suggest,

Mr. Speaker—in fact I urge—that consideration be given to raising that maximum up to \$20, so that the maximum available for those entitled to receive old-age assistance would be \$60.

It is typical of the economy of the Province of Ontario at the present time, that only 135 out of every 1,000 in the 65-69 age group qualify for old-age assistance, that is, who need old-age assistance within the definition of the federal regulations. This may be compared with a figure of 210 out of every 1,000 for the rest of Canada. Our provincial economy has been maintained at such a level that our older folk are able to take care of themselves, and I suggest again to the hon. leader of the CCF Party that is much the better way.

It is true there are some 1,800 in this province of ours now receiving supplementary old-age assistance from the province and the municipalities.

The City of Toronto is on record, I believe, that it is willing to participate with the province in raising the maximum to \$20. I think the cost has been estimated, for the year 1956 for the City of Toronto, should a maximum of \$20 be granted, to be around \$51,000. I believe that the figure for the whole province would be reasonably comparable, and, Mr. Speaker, every single dollar of that cost I feel would bring far more comfort to the recipients than the average dollar would to most people. It is that single dollar which makes the difference between comfort and hardship, that is the important dollar.

The province at the present time has, through its special home-care maintenance introduced only recently in the province, provided benefits to certain people which reach, or in some cases, perhaps exceed, the sum of \$60.

Our institutional care for the aged in the Province of Ontario is of the finest character, and I would commend the hon. Minister of Welfare—and will bring this to his attention—that it is good to hear from time to time of the grants which are being made to these institutions. Only recently the Metro members received notification that we

were contributing \$1.5 million to the Home for the Aged at Newmarket.

While we are doing those things, we must always bear in mind those people who wish to live on their own within a community, and I think we should do all possible to permit them to live in that way, and not cause hardship to one single individual who wishes to live on his or her own.

And so I urge the government, the hon. Prime Minister, and the hon. Minister of Welfare, to take into serious consideration a proposal which has already come to them from the municipality perhaps mostly affected, that the province and the municipality share a maximum in the future, not of \$10, but of \$20, where the need is shown.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, that is the CCF policy.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear that in the speech by the hon. member yesterday.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, it is in effect in Saskatchewan.

MR. YAREMKO: I am dealing with the policy in the Province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I hope the hon. member will be able to persuade them, as he is on the right track.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks on this topic—which is the only one to which I will speak today—but I do want to have this make an impression, that I think the time is ripe for a study in the Province of Ontario of the future economic needs of our older people.

Under our system of health standards, Mr. Speaker, our people in this Province of Ontario are living longer and longer with each passing year. There are more people in the over-65 group now than there ever has been in the past, and I believe the group will continue to grow in numbers. So I say the time is ripe for a thorough study to see how the productive capacities of our

senior citizens may be continued, and maintained—certainly not cut off—and perhaps the age barrier for employment should be reviewed, as well as the question of compulsory retirement.

And as an aspect of job counselling of those over 65 years of age, full use should be made of the capacity of these people, so they will continue to be able to look after themselves, and not have to have someone extending a helping hand to them.

Mr. Speaker, in looking to the future, we should never forget those who created the past upon which that future must be built.

MR. R. J. BOYER (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, in congratulating you upon the position which you occupy in this hon. House, I feel I need only recall to your mind that wonderful occasion in your own riding last September when the electors of Dufferin-Simcoe demonstrated their pride in your election as Speaker and the affection in which you and Mrs. Downer are held. On a fine summer evening they crowded into Creemore Arena where a rally had been arranged by them to honour you. I was one of the 10 hon. members of this House present on that occasion.

Your constituents, Mr. Speaker, showed in no uncertain way their high regard for yourself by listening to addresses by those 10 members and a number of others, all through a long evening. I was pleased to be able to assist on this occasion and to witness this testimonial to the wisdom of the choice of yourself as "Mr. Speaker" and I sense that their approval is shared throughout the membership of this Legislature.

I congratulate the hon. members who presented the motion now being debated. Although I am only slightly his senior in the House, I felt it a privilege to say *bienvenue* to the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney) and congratulate him, not only upon his recent election as member, but also upon the speech he delivered here.

The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) has long been re-

cognized as one of the most capable debaters in this House and his address in seconding the motion was an oratorical accomplishment of a high degree. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie referred to some disadvantage in his new location in the House.

If I may speak personally, I would express special appreciation of the location of my seat. Not only can I see all that goes on, but I have Your Honour's seat adjacent to my own and when you are not using the top of your desk here I seek that privilege for, as a newspaperman accustomed to having space to lay papers which may, or may not, have some value to myself and, of that value, only myself can be the judge.

Muskoka is again recognized in this House as a riding by itself, an arrangement which is entirely satisfactory to my constituents and for which they thank the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members who agreed that this should be so. In our riding the hon. Prime Minister spoke of the great history of Muskoka and of its special character which makes it inopportune to tie it up with any adjoining area to make a constituency.

Muskoka is, indeed, a land of history; I would say of peaceful history in keeping with its tourist attractions and the benefits it bestows upon those who resort there at the time of their vacations to seek rest and recreation.

But, in that history, the names of individual legislators of this province figure largely. I can mention today such a name as that of the hon. William B. Robinson, brother of Chief Justice Sir J. B. Robinson of as long ago as the Rebellion times. Mr. William B. Robinson was for 5 terms, I believe, member for Simcoe in the Parliaments of pre-confederation Canada at a time when the undeveloped Muskoka District would have been part of Simcoe.

He is described by one writer as a most intelligent and well-informed gentleman and famed for his influence over the Indian population. This latter attribute was due in part at least to his days in the fur trade. In the early years



of the 19th century he established a house on what is now called Yoho Island in Lake Joseph, as one location to carry on his fur-trading business. He had there a garden, the flowers from which were found growing 40 or 50 years later when early summer residents, the old Muskoka Club of Toronto, took over the island.

I mention Mr. Robinson particularly because, as the original discoverer of that place, he gave its name, of Lake Joseph, to that beautiful piece of water, and Lake Rosseau to the lake of that name, using the Christian name and surname of his bookkeeper, Joseph Rosseau, for that purpose.

On the other hand, Lake Muskoka was named after the small band of Indians who lived along its shores. These Indians were followers of Chief Mesqua Ukee, a Chippawa Indian, who fought in the war of 1812-14, winning a medal from King George. It is from him that Muskoka takes its name. I would add that other lakes, Mary, Vernon, Fairy, Peninsula and Lake of Bays, were given their names by a provincial employee who explored the area in 1853 for the government.

I would also mention the name of A. P. Cockburn. If hon. members will look at the picture of the first legislature of Ontario which hangs in a corridor of this Parliament Building, they will see a handsome figure standing near Mr. Speaker of that day. It is that of Mr. Cockburn, the member then for Victoria County. Over the years, many fine-appearing gentlemen have represented Victoria; indeed I may say that over the years many fine appearing gentlemen have represented Victoria County. In 1867 Muskoka was part of Victoria for electoral purposes. In the year 1863, when Mr. Cockburn was reeve of Eldon Township, he visited the Muskoka Lakes and was so much impressed with the possibilities he found there that he wrote to Hon. D'Arcy McGee offering to place steamboats on the lakes if navigational obstructions were removed at the locations now known as Port Carling and Port Sandfield.

The first boat was the *Wenonah* and when it was launched in 1864, the great era of steamboat days began, bringing about the colonization of the district. Other forms of transportation are popular today but we still have fine summer pleasure steamers on our lakes. Mr. Cockburn became the federal member for Muskoka when it was made a federal constituency in 1872.

It was in 1886 that Muskoka District first became a provincial riding. It has sent members to this House to support the Conservative cause, for the most part, among them Mr. G. F. Marter who was at one time leader of the Party. The only exception to the Conservative tradition was Dr. Samuel Bridgland, who had the support of many elements in our district and who appears to have been well received by Premier Ross, because 55 years ago this month he moved the reply to the Address, being associated in that with Louis J. Breithaupt, father of our present vice-regal representative.

Muskoka was combined with North Ontario in 1934 when my friend J. Frank Kelly, from whom I had a cordial letter at the opening of the session, won it for the Liberal-Progressive Party, sitting until 1945. Then, Hon. Arthur Welsh, our first Cabinet Minister, was elected and served our riding faithfully and well until his retirement a year ago. I have found that Col. Welsh is held in the same high regard by all of the senior members of this House as he is by his former constituents.

Muskoka District was restored as a riding last June. When I was elected, I became the first son of Muskoka to be its representative in this House, a fact which is significant only in demonstrating how young our district is in its development.

But I was not the first Muskoka-born member to be elected, for our present hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) has been in this House for some years. We are proud of Hon. Phillip Kelly in Muskoka. We are very fond of him and are always glad to welcome him on his visits there. I thank him for his visits and hope that we may invite him

to come back home to Baysville or other communities of Muskoka on many future occasions. In addition, I would say it was a pleasure to welcome him in recent years to the field of weekly newspaper publishers.

I am grateful to hon. members of the Cabinet and other hon. members for their visits to, and their interest in, our district. Many of them may be classed as summer visitors, among those who have called on official business I am grateful to the hon. Prime Minister, who officially opened Santa's Village on Muskoka River, which is a new form of tourist attraction in Muskoka and which, in its first year, enjoyed an attendance of over 207,000 visitors of all ages.

We had the pleasure also of welcoming the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger), and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) who was there during the time that he was making a tour of several judicial centres in the northern part of the province.

I believe the hon. Attorney-General also visited several of the county seats in southern Ontario and it seems fitting that I should draw to the attention of the House that since his appointment he has endeavoured to familiarize himself with all the judicial buildings in all parts of the province.

I am not forgetting the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity for I wish to speak in part of the time allotted to me upon the importance of his department to Muskoka. I congratulate him and the Attorney-General upon their elevation to Cabinet rank, well deserved in both cases.

Just briefly, I wish to refer to agriculture. We have in Muskoka a district of lakes and rocks, but we also have a number of good farms and are grateful to the department and its local agricultural representative, Mr. Tipper, for all the help given. There are, it is true, abandoned farms in Muskoka. I have thought that if there comes a time when the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) should decide to establish more demonstration farms, that

Muskoka and near-by areas with their special problems of soil and rock conditions and their opportunity of selling foodstuffs to the tourist trade, deserve special consideration.

If that should ever be the case, I believe a demonstration farm in Muskoka could give impetus to the cause of agriculture there. At one time Muskoka was well known as a sheep raising country but this is not the case today. Generally speaking, this is due to the depredations on flocks of sheep by wolves, and I would propose that consideration be given by The Department of Lands and Forests to strong efforts to wipe out the wolves in that part of the province.

The need for more manufacturing industries in Muskoka is apparent. We have high hopes for progress in this direction from the efforts of the Georgian Bay Industrial Development Association of which Muskoka and Parry Sound Districts form Zone 4. This association was established less than a year ago under the policy of The Department of Planning and Development when the hon. member (Mr. Warrender) who is now vice-chairman of the HEPC, was in charge of that department. I understand that the programme of area development associations was first proposed by the hon. Prime Minister and credit must go to him for this very worthy policy.

Last fall I was invited to take part in the official opening of two splendid new public schools at Baysville and in the Township of Monck. Another new school is under construction at Dwight. A 14-room public school is to be built at Bracebridge this year, while Draper Township is planning a new school building. Almost all of our rural schools in Muskoka enjoy the benefits of the school area system and year by year we are seeing improvements made in the existing school buildings, or new ones being constructed.

One new school that I visited during the fall, Mr. Speaker, was a beautiful little building at Go Home Bay, a rather remote spot on the shores of Georgian Bay, serving a few families in that

sparsely populated part of Muskoka District.

I believe it can be claimed that the increase in grants to schools in Muskoka in 10 years from \$98,893 in 1944 to \$494,393 in 1954, represents a tremendous advance in increasing educational opportunities in our district.

To mention a few specific instances, the elementary school grant in the Town of Bala in 1944 was \$259, as compared with \$3,315 in 1954, and here are figures for other towns and villages:

|                              | 1944    | 1954     |
|------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Bracebridge .....            | \$2,642 | \$19,156 |
| Gravenhurst .....            | 3,309   | 23,379   |
| Huntsville .....             | 3,777   | 24,816   |
| Village of Port Carling .... | 315     | 4,281    |
| Village of Windermere .....  | 288     | 1,714    |

That, Mr. Speaker, is for elementary schools. In the case of secondary schools, total grants in 1944 were \$9,538, as against \$125,193 in 1954.

I maintain that the proportion of increase was not matched in any previous period. In addition, there have been special grants of \$4 per pupil last year and of \$6 per pupil in the year ahead.

Muskoka lies on the route from southern Ontario to the far northern parts of our province. The historic artery to the north has been Highway No. 11, which is being rebuilt. Gravenhurst and Bracebridge have been bypassed and the by-pass at Huntsville will be a reality before too long. By day, year round, this road carries a great volume of traffic, traffic which is tremendously increased in the summer vacation months by those coming to our resorts. By night, the highway is brightened continuously by the headlights of great truck transports as they cover the miles to northern Ontario.

Then we have Highway No. 69 ever increasing in importance. On the west side of Muskoka, construction is proceeding on the Trans-Canada Highway and the coming construction season will witness a great deal of activity in the Township of Gibson. All of these are north-south routes. I commend the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) for

his policy of looking towards east-west routes as well, and the first east-west highway in Muskoka will be No. 118, which will follow the route between Glen Orchard and Dorset through the central part of the district.

I should like to mention also that in the Official Road Map of Ontario, copies of which were distributed today to hon. members, it will be noticed that secondary roads have all been numbered. In our part of the province we welcome this new policy of the Department of Highways, because our summer resort operators, in printing their literature, are anxious to give directions to those who may be coming to spend their holidays with them and it is much easier to give the route to be followed to their resorts if they can mention roads by numbers.

Before I leave the subject of highways, I wish to refer to the great improvements made possible in municipal roads through the grants now given. I know that many municipalities decided to do more work on their local roads but I think that, generally speaking, they can be commended for the fine way in which they are caring for the traffic needs of their own areas.

Our chief industry in Muskoka is the tourist business. 1955 was a record year in Muskoka as, indeed, it was throughout the province. The travel industry ranks 5th among the 5 basic economies of Ontario. The gross value of production in manufacturing and industry is around \$10 billion; agriculture well over \$1 billion; minerals \$577 million; forest products \$500 million; and travel \$250 million. It is carefully estimated that Ontario receives 60 per cent. of the total travel business of Canada.

Last year 10 million visitors came to our province and, as closely as can be gauged, they spent here at least \$250 million. I say that the expenditure of that amount of money in Ontario cannot fail to have a strong effect on our provincial economy and cannot fail to benefit the people of the province in general. The amount of food consumed benefits the farmer in the supplying of meat, general farm and dairy products. Retail



stores, restaurants, service stations benefit, so do lumber mills, furniture manufacturers and the clothing business.

Resorts, of course, benefit most directly and I know that the great majority of resort owners say that 1955 was the best year they ever had. Ontario's standing as a leader in the tourist industry is due, in an overwhelming degree, to the hard work of our Department of Travel and Publicity.

I am proud that it was the Party to which I belong that brought this department into being and that it was my predecessor in this House, hon. Arthur Welsh, who organized the department 10 years ago. I must add that I am proud of the fact that it was the Conservative Party which established the Canada Travel Bureau at Ottawa.

I well remember that in pre-war days the Ontario Government of that time was urged again and again to create a department for the promotion of the tourist business, but this was not done. Of course, there was some lack of appreciation in those days—in a general way—of the value of the tourist business. But any such doubts, I believe, disappeared some time ago.

The Department of Travel and Publicity fills a need in assisting the tourist business, as does The Department of Agriculture in farming. The Provincial Treasury benefits from travel business. For example, if 18 million visitors bought only 10 gallons of gas each and paid \$1.10 in gas tax—the revenue in gas tax alone would come to \$20 million. If only half of these visitors, 9 million, were to buy a bottle of liquor each, the tax would yield another \$10 million, and if these suppositions are correct, the revenue from these two items to the government would be \$30 million.

Then carry the spending of 18 million people into the stores and service businesses of the province and you can see, Mr. Speaker, how valuable this business is. It has been said by the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity that for every dollar the government is spending on promoting the travel industry—in adver-

tising and periodicals, on radio and by promotional literature—for every dollar spent, we are getting back \$250 in new money in Ontario.

The department, in the last two years, has promoted a campaign of "Knowing Ontario Better," urging our own people to get about the province and find out just what a grand place this is. This is of great value in an educational way to our own people.

One of the problems of the resort business, particularly in the Muskoka District, is that too many people come at one time—during the last two weeks of July and the first two weeks in August. Large industrial plants close down some time during those two weeks adding to the congestion. I would suggest that those responsible for arranging these vacation periods consider taking the less busy times of early July or late August. I say to those interested in the welfare of labour that such an action will result in prolonging the employment of workers in resorts and the many allied businesses. I am happy to advise that the provincial organization of chambers of commerce has been viewing this problem and has added its voice to the proposal to make vacations in early July or late August more popular.

Muskoka has its special place in the travel picture as an outstanding vacation area with more resorts and probably the best lakes. The visitors, whether from other parts of Ontario, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania or New York States or beyond, are greatly impressed by our large fresh water lakes, pine forests, attractive countryside and the resorts.

Cottages in Muskoka are becoming more and more popular and it is now fairly general for the year-round resident population to represent only from 10 to 15 per cent. of the total assessment of some townships. The summer is not the only time to come to Muskoka. Cottage owners are now coming any time of the year. New stress is being placed upon the autumn season with what we call our "Cavalcade of Colour" programmes, at a time when

the countryside is ablaze with the splendour of foliage in autumn colours.

When the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cathcart) paid his first official visit to Muskoka last autumn, he made a very fine impression upon our people and was told more than once of the importance of the work, over which he has direction, to our district. So, on behalf of the Muskoka people, we praise the work of that department and urge that its efforts never be relaxed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks to all those who have welcomed me here as a new member. I take my responsibility to my riding seriously and, therefore, am grateful to

hon. members of the government for much help and advice.

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): On Monday, Mr. Speaker, we will take up business on the Order paper and will continue with the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.30 of the clock, p.m.









# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Monday, February 13, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Monday, February 13, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Re Dr. van Nostrand's letter, Mr. Foote .....   | 185 |
| Seed Potatoes Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....                     | 187 |
| Ontario Food Terminal Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....             | 187 |
| Farm Products Marketing Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....           | 187 |
| Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading ..... | 187 |
| Co-operative Loans Act, 1956, Bill intituled, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....         | 188 |
| Presentation of Reports, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 188 |
| Limited Partnership Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....             | 188 |
| Summary Convictions Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....             | 189 |
| Land Titles Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                     | 190 |
| Settled Estates Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....                 | 190 |
| Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Whicher .....    | 191 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Murdoch .....   | 205 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost .....  | 205 |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petition has been received:

Of the Corporation of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement for the sale of a parcel of land to the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to speak on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I have now made inquiries regarding the question of privilege which the hon. member for York South raised in the Legislature on Friday, February 10.

I have taken this matter up with Dr. van Nostrand and will read and table my letter and his reply.

First of all, may I say that I had absolutely no previous knowledge of this incident, or I would have not permitted it.

Secondly, it had never occurred to me to question Mr. MacDonald's war service. I knew nothing about it, nor was I curious about it. From his own description of it, I must say that it sounds to me as though it had been a most interesting and important job.

In view of all the rancour that has been aroused in my department over the references to military-mindedness, I would suggest to the CCF leader that all such references be dropped in the future.

The Commissioner of Federal Prisons is a General who has made a notable contribution in the field of penology. The Deputy Minister is a full Colonel, who has fought in two wars and has 32 years' service to his credit. Dr. van Nostrand served in the ranks in the first war, transferred to the Royal Air Force, and has had continuous service, including active service in the Second World War. Miss Macneill served with the rank of Commander and at present holds that active service rank. The governor of the Don Jail, the superintendent at Guelph and many others held senior ranks.

The plain and unmistakable assumption of the hon. member from York South that long service, resulting in promotion, makes a man or woman backward in his approach to reform and rehabilitation, is nothing but unadulterated nonsense.

I want to state in the case of Col. Basher that no one could have been more enthusiastic or helpful in the introduction of new approaches to the problem of penology, and I submit that no man is in a better position to say this than his own Minister.

The constant sniping that has gone on will in the end make it difficult to retain good staff and will discourage others from coming into the service.

The van Nostrand incident has simply highlighted a general feeling of resentment and is an indication that there is a limit of propriety which must be observed, not only by civil servants, but by members of the Legislature.

I want to co-operate to the fullest extent with every member of the House and I assure you now, that if you have any problems in connection with the department and if you will bring them to me, everything will be done to give you information and assist your constituents.

I will read now the letter I wrote to Doctor van Nostrand, following the raising of this question of privilege in the House on Friday. It is as follows:

February 13, 1956.

DEAR DOCTOR VAN NOSTRAND:

On Friday, February 10, 1956, Mr. Donald C. MacDonald, MPP, arose in the Legislature on a point of privilege, to read a copy of a letter which you had sent to him and which you had submitted for publication to the *Globe and Mail*.

I would suggest that in a case like this, it is impossible for a civil servant to disassociate himself from his official position and act in a private capacity.

I can understand your rancour because of the aspersions that were cast on your division, but I insist that any points you wish to raise must be brought to my attention and I, if I think it advisable or necessary, will bring these before the Legislature.

In the future this policy must be followed and in order to deal with the above incident, I suggest that you furnish me with a reply which I can read in the House and which will be satisfactory to Mr. MacDonald.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) JOHN W. FOOTE.

The reply I received from Doctor van Nostrand is as follows:

February 13, 1956

DEAR MR. FOOTE:

In relation to the inquiry you directed to me concerning the letter I addressed to Mr. Donald MacDonald, MPP, I beg to reply.

At the time the letter was written, I was extremely exasperated at what I felt then and still consider to be an unfair reflection on myself and those associated with me.

In sending the letter to Mr. MacDonald, I now realize I offended against the usual order of things. I know that the proper course is to address any grievance to you as Minister, and leave it to you to deal with it in your wisdom.

I sincerely regret not having followed the proper procedure in this instance and must insist again on emphasizing to you that I regard Mr. MacDonald's attack on my division as unfair and without any basis of fact.

I withdraw the remarks about Mr. MacDonald's war service and accept his statement regarding the same.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) F. H. VAN NOSTRAND, M.B.,  
Director of Psychiatry and Neurology.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, copies of this statement were given to the Press earlier. I have seen it and I have made a statement which is already in the hands of the Press. Lest the hon. Prime Minister may once again accuse us on this side of the House of not being willing to say in the House what we say outside, I beg the privilege of reading it. It is very brief. It is as follows:

Reforms Minister Foote's statement is simply not good enough. It merely continues the government policy of evasion with regard to my charges of what goes on within The Department of Reform Institutions.

I am glad to learn that Major Foote knew nothing of Dr. van Nostrand's letter. But that does not alter the fact that his reaction and tactics in dealing with my statements have followed an identical pattern.

Major Foote's reaction to my charges was to indulge in good part in a personal attack on me, and to misrepresent and misdirect what I have said as an attack on civil servants.

Dr. van Nostrand has followed suit, with a vicious personal attack on me, and an attempt to misdirect what I have said as an attack on ex-service personnel.

Neither of them has yet come to grips with my basic criticism of what is going on in our Department of Reform Institutions.

In short, what this government is doing is precisely the same thing as they did with the highways scandal. They are trying to "laugh it off," and "slough it off," to cover up, rather than clean up the situation.

The world is presently celebrating the birthday of a man, Abraham Lincoln, who once declared: "I'd rather be right than be President."

This government has slipped so far below that high level of political morality that its motto might well be: "I'd rather be wrong, and live with it, than be caught and have to clean it up publicly."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to revert to the Introduction of Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

### THE SEED POTATOES ACT

Hon. F. S. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This Bill contains two minor amendments, changing the name of our "Crops, Seeds and Weeds Branch" to that of "Field Crops Branch," and also dealing with a clause regarding the restricted area for growing seed potatoes. On second reading I shall elaborate on this more fully.

### THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: The main purpose of this Bill is to establish a sinking fund for making payments on debentures. The fund will be handled by the hon. Provincial Treasurer and payments will be

made from the fund to retire the cost of construction of the terminal.

The penalty section also is being revised to remove the minimum penalty for any offense.

The minimum penalty is regarded as being too severe for minor infringements, such as parking in the wrong place, which handicaps the magistrate who may be conducting a case.

On second reading I will explain this further.

All the Bills I introduce now and later, will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

### THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the only amendment to this Act is to make clearer that the purpose of the Act is limited to the Province of Ontario. This appears advisable, in view of the pending reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of the question of the validity of Ontario's marketing legislation.

The suggestion comes from Mr. Magone, Q.C., who will state our case during the preliminary discussions on the submissions to be made to the Supreme Court. I will give further details on second reading. I wish to say now that this Act was never defined as applying within the limitation of the Province of Ontario, as it should have been.

### THE JUNIOR FARMER ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1952

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.



He said: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the House who were here in 1952 will recall that in the Act the amount of money voted and stated in the Act was \$10 million. The amount of loans now made stand at something in excess of \$10 million. All of this money in excess of \$10 million, of course, has not been granted, although it may have been approved. The Act, as it now stands, limits the loans to \$10 million, and the purpose of this Act is to increase the amount of money available for loans to \$20 million.

The second section of the Act clarifies it a little, and provides that loans may be made to either a farmer, his wife, or both of them jointly.

Sections 3 and 4 of the Act provide that the appropriation for any year will be voted by the Legislature after April 1, 1957, but, otherwise, the Act comes into force on Royal Assent.

Previously, the House did not vote the costs of the administration of the Act, and the clause to which I have referred in section 3 provides the House shall vote the Estimate for the cost of the administration of this Act.

### THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT, 1956

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill revises The Co-operative Marketing Loans Act, with the following changes in principle:

1. The name is changed by the removal of the word "marketing", as the purpose for which the Co-operative Association is organized may not be essentially limited to marketing.

2. A board is to be established known as the "Co-operative Loan Board" to administer the Act.

3. Recommendations in respect of loans and guarantees of bank loans will

be made by the board but, as formerly, the loans will be made and guarantee of bank loans authorized by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

4. Provision is made for loans up to \$100,000, but not more than 50 per cent. of the value of the real properties of the Co-operative Association, to be secured by a first mortgage on the properties.

The present ceiling is \$65,000 for cold storage co-operatives, and \$15,000 for other co-operative associations.

5. Provision is made for an agreement between the hon. Minister and each co-operative association to ensure that the control of its management and operation remains in the hands of the producers until the loan is repaid.

6. For the better securing of a loan, the board is authorized to require a chattel mortgage at the time a loan is made, although this is not compulsory.

7. Application of the Act to any corporation other than a co-operative corporation is extended for the purpose of providing cold-storage facilities for producers of farm products, where the majority of the issued stock of the corporation is held by producers. This applies, Mr. Speaker, in one case specifically to a situation in the riding of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. The report of the Ontario Veterinary College for the year ended March 31, 1955.

2. The 79th annual report of the Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm for the year ended March 31, 1955.

### THE LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 61, "An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act."

He said: With your permission, and that of the House, I will make a few remarks on the principle of the Bill. The hon. member for York South thought there was a little confusion in some of my statements the other day, so I will be particularly careful at this time.

This Bill is an Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act. The Limited Partnerships Act provides for a method for forming a partnership of that nature to do brokerage, financial, mercantile and other types of business, and it provides it may consist of one or more partners, some of whom may be general partners, and some of whom may be limited partners, and in a case of limited partners, they shall not be liable for the debts of the partnership beyond the amount contributed by them to the partnership.

The Act also provides for a certificate signed by all the partners, general and limited, to be made out in a form provided in the Act. As it now stands, the Act, by sections 7 and 8, provides for the registration or filing of a certificate in the case of a limited partnership in the office of the county or district court of the county or district in which the partnership named in the certificate is situated, and provides for a general filing fee.

In the general partnership, it follows somewhat the same form as a certificate, but they are now filed in the Registry of Land Titles offices. This Bill now makes provision for the filing not only by limited partnerships, but general partnership certificates in the same offices, that is, the registry offices, where searches in future can be made for both types of partnership in the same office. This seems to be a logical move.

Also this Act provides that existing records or books which have been kept by the clerk of the county or district court for a limited partnership shall be transferred to the proper district registry offices.

I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act."

He said: These Bills will all be referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

The new Criminal Code, section 20, reads as follows:

"A warrant or summons which is authorized by this Act may be issued or executed on a Sunday or statutory holiday."

In order to bring the practice under The Summary Convictions Act in line with that section, the provisions of this amending Act will provide for summons being issued or executed on Sundays or legal holidays.

With respect to another amendment, that is, the method of collecting against a corporation when a fine has been levied, prior to the new Criminal Code, the procedure which we are now suggesting be re-enacted into this Bill, was followed. But the new Criminal Code omitted from it this type of procedure, and provided, instead, that in the case of a corporation, a conviction may be filed in the Supreme Court, and recovered as a judgment of that court.

This was regarded as a very clumsy procedure, and provision for distress in the case of a corporation is a very effective means of collection.

Previously, by section 2 of the present Bill—which now becomes 7(b) if enacted—upon the conviction or order which involves payment of money by a corporation, the penalty shall be levied by distress and sale of sufficient goods and chattels of the corporation. For such purpose, a justice may issue a warrant of distress, commanding a peace officer forthwith to make sufficient distress of goods and chattels of the corporation, and if within 10 days after the making of the distress order, the penalty is not satisfied, the goods may be sold. That is considered to be a quick and ready method of securing the recovery of a fine.

Then the third amendment is to provide that an appeal be taken by an informant or defendant to the Court of Appeal on any grounds which involve a question of law alone.

I might say that last fall there was a case which created considerable public interest in Dresden, and at that time, by virtue of the fact that there was no specific provision for an appeal by the complainant on a point of law, it was found an appeal could not be taken, and in the case of *Regina ex rel. Carroll and Curry*, cited in 1955 *Ontario Weekly Notes*, page 513, the Court of Appeals determined that the informant had no right to apply for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal in a summary conviction case.

That was subsequently upheld in another case, *Regina ex rel. Irvine and Duesling*, cited in 1955 *Ontario Weekly Notes*, page 588. There it was determined the Crown had no right of appeal to the Court of Appeal on behalf of the informant. These two decisions settled the law. These amendments will permit an appeal to be taken by a complainant or defendant to the Court of Appeal by leave of the court.

I move second reading of Bill No. 64.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments in this Bill No. 65, and I might briefly refer to some of them.

First, the amendment to the Act will provide for a Senior Deputy Master as well as a Deputy Master, and in the event of the death or incapacity of the Master, then the Senior Deputy Master will have power to act in place of the Master.

The amendment also provides for a new post of Director of Titles, whose duties are to be of a supervisory nature.

This appears in section 16 of the Bill, where that provision is made.

Also a definite period of time within which a wife can claim her dower provided in the Act, and the proper procedure to follow, and what will follow after a certain length of time in that connection.

Certain powers are given when a claim is made against land sold by any process of law, and certain powers to delete from the registration of Letters Patent are withdrawn. The amendment also permits the Director of Titles to apply, in certain cases, for an order of registration of a plan and contribution to the cost of the plan, and that the Director of Titles may designate by direction a subdivision plan area.

These are all matters of some detail, but of some considerable importance. That is the full effect of Bill No. 65.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General a question in connection with the wife's dower? What happens in the event that the wife does not make the claim within the specific number of days?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this says:

If the wife of the registered owner claims her right to dower within the 30 days, the proper Master of Titles may hear and determine her claim.

Where a person claims that registered land is free from dower and no instrument can be produced and registered showing release of dower by the wife of the registered owner, the proper Master of Titles may, upon satisfactory evidence produced before him, give notice to the wife to support her claim to dower in the registered land within 30 days.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

### THE SETTLED ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend The Settled Estates Act."



He said: This is one of a group of 6 Acts. The other 5 have been read the second time, Mr. Speaker, and I am now moving second reading of this Bill.

The only reason I did not proceed with it on an earlier occasion was that it was not printed at that time. I made some extensive remarks at the time on the whole question of estate's tail, and this is the 6th Act to be amended in order to give effect to it.

The effect of this amendment is to deal with a number of sections which outline in some detail the procedure to be taken to determine the type of estate involved, and in place of it to add a subsection which reads as follows:

Subject to the provisions of this section, every application to the court under this Act shall be made with the concurrence or consent of all those in existence having any estate or beneficial interest under the settlement and of all trustees having any estate or interest on behalf of any unborn child.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I would like to congratulate you upon your appointment to the high office of Speaker. I know you will carry out your new duties with despatch and fairness to all hon. members of the House.

During the reading of the Speech from the Throne, I was very much interested in the comments regarding a health insurance proposal, and this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with that particular problem as it will affect all of the hon. members of this House as the days go by.

I think the people of the Province of Ontario have shown commendable initiative in providing protection against the cost of hospitalization for themselves over the past number of years. I think, too, that the private insurance companies

and organizations such as the Blue Cross and medical groups have done an excellent job so far in providing this type of needed protection for the citizens of Ontario. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, today there are close to 4 million people covered by some type of health coverage in the province.

I want to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, and through you the hon. members, the fact that a good job has been done by the many companies doing business in our great province, and also by the 7,500 licensed insurance agents in the Province of Ontario.

It seems this matter of health is one of primary concern to all Parties. Everybody is interested in the health of the citizens, and it would appear that the time has arrived when we can enlarge the sphere of work in which the government has been so active in the past, and extend it into the field of hospitalization coverage so that all of our citizens—numbering 5¼ million—of our province can make available this coverage to themselves.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the proposals today—and I do not think there has been anything of a very definite nature done as it is very much in the study stage—are brought forward to provide a basic hospital coverage for every citizen in the province—including diagnostic care—at a basic premium, putting it on a compulsory basis where everybody must pay a certain premium for the coverage they receive.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear that this is not free insurance. In talking to the people on the street, I have found, as have other hon. members no doubt, that a great many people are under the impression this will be free government insurance. There is nothing free about it. You are going to get a certain form of protection, but it is quite necessary that you contribute by way of premiums.

As a matter of fact, I can see where this is going to be one of the big problems to be discussed by those interested in this new extension of health service, to come up with a solution as to how we

are going to make these premium collections, because I can visualize there are many ways of doing it. After all, the scheme cannot possibly be a success unless we have an easy way of collecting premiums—if there is an easy way.

I think the insurers are interested in this phase of extending health insurance on behalf of the government, and I feel the thought at the present time is that we should have adequate active hospital beds in which to take care of our people who have become hospitalized.

I was very much interested in the comments and some of the proposals regarding the plan, whereby it might be possible to provide certain hospital care at home. As we all know, there are many, many thousands of our citizens to whom hospitals are not available. They are not living in the vicinity of a hospital, yet if they do require care, it will be necessary to provide them with that coverage. In other words, it might be that we should not base it definitely on the premise that you have to be hospitalized in order to collect any benefits, and I think that serious consideration should be given to the out-patient idea.

I was very much interested in a recent speech made by the hon. Minister of Health last Monday, February 6. I thought he gave a very comprehensive review of the hospital scheme, and what is proposed for the people of Ontario. He has been very active in promoting this plan and has a complete understanding of it.

Mr. Speaker, I think consideration should be given to processing this hospital insurance through private insurers or through the people who are already in the business. After all, there is a certain amount of "know-how" involved. There are great records insofar as schemes are concerned; there is a wealth of available information at the disposal of the government through private insurers and other organizations in the same business.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. Prime Minister's remark that before the Standing Committee on Health at this session of this House, an opportunity will be given to everyone, including

agents, companies, hon. members of this House, and anybody else who is interested in the matter of health insurance, to appear before the committee and give their ideas, views and suggestions, so that we can use that material to the very best advantage.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that when entering into a programme—which in my opinion is the greatest health insurance programme ever organized or proposed by any provincial government in Canada, and certainly one which is going to have a direct effect on every citizen of the province for many years to come—we must certainly take it easy and be cautious, and look into every phase of the situation.

It is necessary that we bring the doctors, the hospitals, the insurance companies and insurance agencies, and of course the public, into our confidence, and in consultation with them, come up with the very best proposal possible.

To give you an idea, Mr. Speaker, of some of the progress made in recent years in the matter of health, I thought the hon. members might be interested in these facts. A great deal of progress has been made since 1900, when the average person had a life expectancy of 47 years. For every 1,000 population, there were over 17 deaths per year. Today, the average life expectancy is 69 years, and the number of deaths per year per 1,000 comes to 9. Medical statistics are giving an encouraging picture of the situation. We learn that much of the progress is due to the control of children's diseases; in other words, great progress has been made in that phase.

Deaths from diphtheria were 40 per 100,000 population in 1900, and now there are none. The same is true of typhoid fever. Malaria has virtually disappeared. For every 1,000 births in 1900, 160 babies died before they were a year old. Today the picture is about 25 deaths per 1,000.

That will give you some idea of the great progress which has been made in regard to health.

People will say, "What about hospital accommodation?" I have here a list of

hospitals and additions to hospitals for the period 1947 to 1955, Mr. Speaker, and it is a very remarkable list. During that time, this government has constructed 34 new hospitals and dozens of additions to existing hospitals.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): "This government has constructed?"

MR. COWLING: That is what I said, yes.

MR. OLIVER: Did I understand the hon. member right? Did he say, "This government has constructed 34 new hospitals?"

MR. COWLING: With their financial help, Mr. Speaker. Does that sound better?

MR. OLIVER: Just a little better.

MR. MacDONALD: A little more accurate.

MR. COWLING: I would not want to give the government credit for anything it did not do, and I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition does not want to.

The point is, they have done a tremendous job during that time. Even here in the City of Toronto—just to mention an area with which we are very familiar—we have the new Sick Children's Hospital which is a model in the health world, the new Mount Sinai Hospital, the addition to St. Joseph's Hospital, the addition to the Western Hospital, they are building a new addition at the present time to the Toronto General Hospital, and in the east end, they are in the midst of a campaign to raise funds for an extension to the East General Hospital. To all of these, our government has made a very sound financial contribution to health in every possible way. This government is a great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I was very much taken with an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* last Thursday, February 9. I think they summed up the situation pretty well. They were talking

about looking into the problem, that we should move with caution and investigate every possible angle. In other words, they say to thoroughly investigate this would take months, perhaps a year, and in the meantime the Ontario government very wisely is giving all interested parties and the general public the opportunity to study the scheme from every angle.

Anybody who wishes to appear before the Health Committee of the Legislature may be heard, and experts will testify regarding this subject in open hearings. In that way, the people of Ontario will know just what advantages, what problems and what expenditures are entailed in this programme.

Incidentally, I think hon. members may be interested in an experience I had last week following this discussion on health insurance. It was my pleasure to attend a rate-payers' group in High Park riding. Among other things, I thought it would be very advisable and very refreshing to get some first-hand information on the subject of health insurance from the people who actually do the voting.

It was very interesting to note that, when speaking of health coverage, the opinions ranged all the way from those who felt that everything should be free and complete and paid for by the government, to the other extreme, that is, to the individuals who felt that they wanted a free choice of their insurance carrier, that they would pay the premium to the company of their choice, and in between ranged a great variety of opinions.

It points out the fact that the citizens of Ontario are interested in this problem, and a great many of them have not definitely decided on what type of approach they would like to make. That indication was proof to me that the government is heading in the right direction in its thorough study of the whole situation.

I have read several of the documents raised at the federal-provincial conferences. This particular one, Mr. Speaker, is the Ontario government's submission



to the Dominion-Provincial Health Conference, dated January 23, 1956.

Among other things, they mention this:

It is expected that the first step in launching this programme will be an extensive survey of facilities and personnel (available and needed) and when this is done, the estimate can be refined.

Very much as I mentioned here this afternoon.

Administration: Several methods of administering a hospital care insurance programme are available. Among these are the following:

1. Administration through voluntary pre-payment plans and commercial insurance companies.

2. Administration by one insurance carrier by contract.

3. Administration by the Hospital Association for administration by a government agency.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that every possibility should be considered in processing, as I have said before, this insurance through voluntary pre-payment plans in commercial insurance companies or by administration by one insurance carrier, or by administration by the hospital association.

These people have a great deal of "know-how," and a great deal of experience which they have gained through the years. It was through their efforts that the matter of health and hospitalization insurance was brought along to the stage where it was given consideration by government. Therefore, I think that consideration should be given to these people.

Another point which was made, Mr. Speaker, is a scheduling coverage.

It will be recognized that the administrative task of insuring over 5 million beneficiaries is a formidable one. Accordingly, while accepting the objective of universal coverage, the Ontario government believes that enrolment can become mandatory only

as the administrative machinery is made available. It is proposed, therefore, to develop the coverage in stages, enrolling first those in employee groups, and then proceeding to insure the self-employed, farmers, etc., until all are covered.

That makes sense to me, Mr. Speaker, because the collecting of premiums will be one of the major problems in this scheme.

I want to urge the government to go slowly in this whole scheme, and when I say that, it is because I remember that the matter of health insurance coverage has been talked about for 25 or 35 years, and as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, it was up to the hon. Prime Minister and this government to bring it along to the stage where possibly in 8 months or a year, hospital coverage could actually become a reality in our province.

The great thing is co-operation with the insurance companies, with the hospital association, and with those people interested, and with a thorough knowledge of the business, in order to give the citizens the best possible coverage.

There are many insurance coverages, not only health insurance, but medical insurance, surgical insurance, accident and sickness insurance, which actually all come under this heading of "health insurance." I believe, as the government does, that the important and the basic step is probably hospitalization, because hospital bills can mount up and cause a great deal of concern and worry to certain citizens. That is the reason why thousands of dollars' worth of insurance has been sold up to date. As far as catastrophic insurance is concerned, that is something which should be considered.

I also read the remarks of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) in that connection, and I agree with them in part. Something could possibly be figured out to provide for unfortunate families, by way of some protection by government so that their life's savings would not go down the drain in the event of an unfortunate illness or accident.

I would like to leave this thought, Mr. Speaker, that if we face the future with confidence and imagination, and with a firm belief that this type of health plan is the right goal, we will be assisting our people, together with those already in the industry, and we can then give the best possible protection for the greatest number of our citizens.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, the first thing I am going to do is to follow the custom of many hon. members here, and pay my respects to you and to congratulate you upon the high position to which you have been elected in this hon. Assembly.

I may say to the hon. members that perhaps I am on a more personal basis than some other hon. members, in that I had the honour of serving in the same regiment overseas. While it is true that I left for my officer's training course, when Mr. Speaker came, and by the time I returned and rejoined my regiment in Italy, Mr. Speaker had gone somewhere else, I have the greatest pleasure in telling the hon. members of this House that I was told by all of the soldiers in that regiment that Mr. Speaker fully carried out his duties in looking after the spiritual welfare of all the boys exceptionally well, and that he also behaved himself as an officer and a gentleman.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Was he born on a farm?

MR. WHICHER: The second thing that I should do in this, my maiden speech in this Assembly, is to remind all of the hon. members here present, of the first time that they spoke in this great building. I can assure all of you that the apprehension that you felt is with me now. I believe that most of us wish to do a good job or, at least, create a good impression in our first attempt, in my particular case as a very amateur politician, in speaking in the Provincial Parliament of Ontario.

In order that I might have a better chance at being successful, I have sought much advice from many older members

of the House. By some I have been told: "By all means, emphasize to the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet their great ability and usefulness to us, the citizens of the province; tell them that we simply cannot understand how the province got along without them before they came on the scene, or, for that matter, how it will get along without them after they pass to their reward."

HON. MR. FROST: It would not "get along" very well.

MR. WHICHER: By that means, I was told, the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Highways might succumb to the praise and finish paving the highway in Bruce County which has been started for so many years. After listening to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, I decided not to use that approach, for I am sure if the Prime Minister "falls" for that sort of nonsense the streets of Sault Ste. Marie will be paved with gold before the year 1956 is through.

May I make myself clear in this regard? I, even as a Liberal member of the Legislature, have the highest respect and admiration for the present hon. Prime Minister, even though I do not agree with his policies in many instances. But, in saying this, I remind all of the members present and also the people of the province that no man—and I repeat no man—is indispensable.

I remember so well in the past war, being in Italy when I heard that that great President of the United States, Franklin Roosevelt, had suddenly died. My first thought was "We have lost the war." But you know we did not—someone else took his place. I hope most sincerely that nothing like that happens to our present hon. Prime Minister for many, many years, but if, perchance, he should die a political death let us be frank and realistic—someone else would take his place.

Other members have suggested that I use an all-out attack method, attack the government from every possible angle and if, perchance, there isn't a weakness, attack them anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I have decided to use a third approach—it is my own. I feel that there is no time a member can be more sincere than in his first speech in this hon. Assembly. Therefore, the thoughts that I have gathered are a few of those that have lingered in my heart for a long time and I have reason to believe they are the thoughts of many of the people whom I have the honour to represent in Bruce County.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to you and, through you, to the hon. members of this House, greetings from the people of Bruce. I have listened with amazement and read with the same result some of the approaches that the hon. members have used in describing the people whom they represent. Since I was a child my favourite advertisement has always been, chiefly because it is short and to the point, and more particularly because it is true: "Red Rose Tea is Good Tea." The people of Bruce are good people: no more need be said.

We are a rural area with half-a-dozen towns scattered throughout this large territory. We are one of the largest counties in the province, one of the largest producers of dairy products in the whole Dominion, as indeed we are of cattle and hogs. Yes, we are vitally interested in the farming industry, as indeed we are in the fishing industry, with by far the largest part of our boundaries being the waters of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay.

For the past number of years and, more particularly since the war, a huge tourist industry has developed and it may well be that in the next quarter of a century practically all the land on the water's edge of the huge Bruce peninsula will have summer cottages on it. In fact, there are thousands there now. Farther south there are lovely sand beaches on the Lake Huron side of the county unsurpassed anywhere, and the towns of Kincardine, Port Elgin and Southampton have great tourist industries to supplement their earnings. Thousands and thousands of city people are spending their holidays with us and we welcome every one of them.

I must not forget the industries of Bruce. Our towns all have a certain amount of industry, mostly furniture factories and articles manufactured from wood products, although there are others, and indeed some new ones that have been brought into the various towns by the herculean efforts of the various chambers of commerce and industrial committees.

Yes, we have industries but unfortunately not enough, which fact I will be discussing in a few minutes. We have many problems in our county and I think this afternoon that I will discuss those problems mostly as they appear to the County of Bruce and, possibly, to the very many other rural ridings in the province.

In speaking of these problems it is inevitable that I must criticize the government in many instances, but before I do I wish to make this point clear. There are too many roads to build in this province, too many bridges and schools to build, too many agricultural and other problems for me to wish this government anything but the greatest of success in its endeavours.

I realize only too well that fundamentally all of us are here in this Parliament for exactly the same purpose—to attempt to leave a little better place for our children and our grandchildren, with better living conditions and an easier way of life. The only difference, as far as I am concerned, is that we try to reach this goal from an opposite point of view.

What then do I regard as my duty as a private and, I might say, a very amateur member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, in attempting to bring to the government's attention the views of the 585,000 people who voted for us in the last election and who, unfortunately, have not, by any means, the proper ratio of members in this House? The very word "opposition" tells us—"to oppose"—not destructively, I hope, but constructively, not with malice, but with an air of friendship—"to oppose" the present government in all measures where by so doing we will, at least, to



our way of thinking, better the government of this great province.

"To oppose" to keep the government more alert; "to oppose" so that we in the Opposition, particularly a junior member such as myself, will learn the fundamentals of government, so that when the pendulum swings, as it always does swing, and a Liberal Government is once again in power in this province, we will know how to govern.

May I say I certainly agree, in the main, with the hon. Prime Minister when he said the other day that criticisms of the government should, as far as possible, be given across the floor of the House. I agree it is the correct attitude and I will attempt to maintain that way of doing things as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and, I might say, somewhat jealous of the advertising of the hon. Prime Minister and his Party before the last election. Oh yes, we must be fair, there was advertising on all sides, not just ours. On every hydro pole, particularly in Guelph, I am informed there was Conservative advertising pointing out that we were getting more road grants, school grants, unconditional grants and pre-election grants than ever before in the history of the province.

As the humble mayor of the little Town of Wiarton I did not have to be told this. In municipal politics a person soon gets to know of these things.

The point was and is—where did you get the money in the first place? Is it not true that every single nickel of every dollar that is given back to the people is taken away from them in the first place in the form of taxes? What possible credit does a government expect, or should it take, for giving back to the people that which is rightfully theirs?

The only problem is to give it back as evenly as possible to ensure the development of the whole province, remembering, too, that all through government the so-called "haves" give to the "have nots." For example, by the Colombo Plan, the Federal Government is helping other nations. By this province's financial arrangements with the

Federal Government, we are undoubtedly helping other provinces and to carry this to a successful end, the areas which "have not" in the province should at least get an even break with those which "have." I sincerely claim that they do not.

I refer today especially to The Unconditional Grants Act of 1954. In this Act, as I am sure all of the hon. members know, there was a basic grant of \$1.50 per capita for each person in any particular municipality. But, as the population increased, starting at 2,000, an extra 10 cents a head was added and so on right up the line until we have arrived at the summit and find that Metropolitan Toronto gets \$4 per head in unconditional grants per annum.

At the other extreme, as an example, I will use my own little Town of Wiarton with a population of slightly under 2,000. My argument is that we, and indeed the hundreds of little towns and villages in the province, should be treated as Toronto and in our case get 4 times 2,000 or \$8,000 in unconditional grants per annum instead of the 2,000 times \$1.50 or \$3,000 we now receive. It makes a difference of \$5,000 per annum, or \$50,000 in 10 years.

May I say to the hon. members from Toronto that, contrary to some opinions, this great city is held in the highest respect by most of the people in the smaller centres of the province. We look with admiration on your high buildings, with every possible form of convenience, your modern schools with gymnasiums and swimming pools, your beautiful and efficient new subway. Even more so, do we watch your great plans for the future whereby this city will not only be, as indeed it is now, the greatest in Canada, but may well be the greatest on the North American Continent. We truly believe that in order to develop you must have money, and I for one am 100 per cent. in favour of you getting your full share of the unconditional grants at \$4 per capita.

But what about Wiarton, Chesley, and the other municipalities of Bruce County? May I humbly remind the Prime Minister that we too pay taxes,

that the gasoline tax is just as much there as here, the products the Liquor Board sells are just as expensive there as here. In short, we pay the same taxes from a provincial angle as do the citizens of Toronto. Indeed we do municipally too. The huge financial buildings and huge industries of the city are not solely the result of Toronto. When I buy an insurance policy in Wiarton, that policy goes through the Toronto office and much of the profit is left here, which, of course, is as it should be and I have no quarrel with it whatsoever. I am merely pointing out that while the smaller municipalities give much of the profit to the companies concerned, Toronto gets all of the municipal taxes and I have no quarrel with that either. Toronto is providing the services and should get the taxes.

No such comparison can be made as far as The Unconditional Grants Act is concerned. Here we all pay in the same amount on a per capita basis. Here all of the provincial tax money goes into one big treasury. The argument given by the government in making a difference according to the municipal population was, I believe, as follows: They claim, and I believe rightly, that the general rule is that the higher the population the higher per capita is the cost of municipal government. I am trying to be very fair in this.

HON. MR. FROST: In municipal government "the higher the cost of social services." In the City of Toronto, for instance, it runs to as high as \$6 and \$8 per capita whereas in the rural areas the social service costs run from about 30 cents per capita, up. That was the basis of the difference in the grants.

MR. WHICHER: I would just like to remark that I believe when you put this through it was to be unconditional and not necessarily used for welfare, but was to go to the general taxpayers.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WHICHER: It is quite true and I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that welfare services cost more

here, but I contend—as you will see as I carry on—that the municipal governing of the amount of tax coming out of my pocket in a small town is on an equal basis with a large city.

But why is the cost higher? When a city has sewers instead of cesspools or septic tanks, sewage disposal plants, gymnasiums and swimming pools in both public and secondary schools, most modern hospitals, transportation systems, 100 per cent. police and fire protection, such things as snow removal on every street and the dozens of other things that get bigger and more expensive as the city or town gets larger and larger, then the rate-payers must be prepared to pay for them.

Obviously, if you have sewers and disposal plants it is going to cost more to run a municipality than if you do not have them. I say to the hon. Prime Minister that if the smaller places had such things as sewers and other services that, in many instances, they have not got now, then the cost of municipal governing would be just as high as in the City of Toronto.

The reason that we have not got them is very simple—we cannot afford them. As an example, the little Town of Southampton voted only last autumn on the construction of sewers and a sewage disposal plant. It was turned down, not that it was not a good thing but because the majority of the citizens honestly believed that they could not afford it. I suggest to the government that had that vote been carried in the affirmative, the cost of governing in Southampton on a per capita basis would have been just as high as in this city.

A further argument against giving the smaller places an equal unconditional grant per capita as the larger ones and used by the government is that the smaller places get much larger school grants. Mr. Speaker, the basis of school grants was passed long before The Unconditional Grants Act came into being and was based on the assessment of any given municipality and more particularly the industrial assessment.

I am told that a good ratio of assessment is about 40 per cent. industrial and 60 per cent. residential. The smaller centres in this province have nothing like that amount. Many of them are lucky to have a 5 per cent. industrial assessment. Industries are wonderful things to have, particularly for the educational costs of the area because they do not require schools. You in the city have that industry.

And so my logical conclusion is that the cost of education has nothing at all to do with the Unconditional Grant. The cost on a percentage basis was evened out long before The Unconditional Grants Act was thought about at all.

It will never be my policy to advocate legislation that this province cannot afford, just to get headlines. Last year, according to the information that I received, almost \$13 million was paid to the municipalities of the province under this Act. To pay everyone at the same rate would cost approximately \$20 million or a difference of only \$7 million. Sincerely, I am not going overboard in this. The province can afford it. It would mean so much to the smaller places.

Our little towns and villages of this great province have no particular desire to become bigger, they just want to become better with a few more of the services that our city friends now take for granted. It would mean so much to them. In Wiarton, based on last year's assessment, it would mean a difference of 5 mills.

The phrase used by the hon. Prime Minister "Forward Ontario" must mean all of Ontario. I ask the Conservative members of this Legislature from the rural ridings to back me in this request, not here, because that would be unfair to ask, but in your caucus room talk it over. You are not here representing the government any more than I am—you are representing your constituency. Think it over.

The next thing which I wish to speak about is hydro and I will deal with this great subject today only as

it concerns the selling of power by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission to the various municipalities of the province. As mayor of Wiarton, I had the privilege of sitting on the Public Utilities which deals with the buying of power from hydro and the selling of the same to the local consumer.

I have found in my experience in municipal politics that hydro is the only form of municipal business where we are allowed to budget for a surplus. If any considerable surplus is accumulated in the council of any municipality in this province, The Municipal Act says that the following year that surplus is to be eaten up by a reduction in taxes immediately. I agree with this legislation because I do not feel that the citizens of today should pay for all the improvements for the benefit of those of tomorrow.

What about the policy of the hydro, a commission formed by this Ontario government and certainly controlled by it? While I agree that hydro should have some control on the selling of power from the local utility board to the consumer, I wonder if it is generally known that before any municipality can give a rate cut to its consumers in spite of huge surpluses, hydro's permission must be granted and that, in many instances, it is refused.

Once again using my own town as an example, I tell you that in spite of being in sound financial state with plenty of liquid assets and a net profit of a considerable amount of money for many years in a row, we were refused our request to give a rate reduction to our consumers in the year 1955. I refer you to the *Hydro Blue Book*, the 47th annual report for the year 1954, the last year that the book has been printed, although I presume that the new one for this past year will be out very shortly.

In statement B of this report, on page 223, it is pointed out that the little Town of Wiarton with 734 customers showed a net profit, after depreciation, of \$6,910.96, or approximately \$9.50 per customer. In statement A, on page



165, it shows that Wiarton has no debenture debt whatsoever, as far as hydro is concerned, with total assets of \$165,129.59 including liquid assets of cash and bonds of \$21,257.42.

Our total operating surplus or, as I prefer to call it, our total overcharge for the people who pay the hydro bills, is listed at \$76,693.13. And yet, when we applied to cut the hydro rates, our request was turned down by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. Am I reasonable in asking why this was done?

In the Town of Hanover, Ontario, with a population of 4,005 made up of 1,354 customers, the following is the case according to hydro's own figures. The net profit for the year 1954 after depreciation was \$14,460.04, or a little over \$10 per customer. I have not any idea whether they applied for a reduction in rate or not but they have no debenture debt whatsoever; and they have total assets of \$470,169.22 including liquid assets of \$107,652.18 in bonds and \$23,614.01 in cash. And may I remind you that they only have 1,354 customers.

If this was a municipal matter and under The Municipal Act, the Town of Hanover would not have to pay any taxes at all in 1956.

Is it fair to ask why the Hydro-Electric Power Commission allows a very obvious overcharge of the citizens of today for the benefit of those of tomorrow?

Let me give you one more example. There are dozens and dozens of them. The City of Windsor with 35,764 customers had a net profit in hydro in the year 1954 of \$1,000,638.03, or approximately \$28 per customer. Quite an overcharge for an old-age pensioner getting \$40 per month, particularly when you can not get it back.

May I point out most humbly that I am not making any charge of any irregularity whatsoever, I am merely stating on evidence that is first hand that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is forcing the municipalities to overcharge their citizens

and that they are most unreasonable in discussing rate reduction.

In my own particular instance, in my own home town they refused to do it in spite of an operating surplus of almost \$7,000 last year, a total operating surplus of over \$76,000 no debenture debt and only 734 customers. This could not happen in the municipality, only in a commission that happens to be operated by this government. Does it sound reasonable?

I wish to speak now, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments on an industry which has been for many, many years, most vital to us in the County of Bruce. I refer to the fishing industry. Unfortunately, during the last few years, that industry has dwindled until now it is practically nil.

I am making absolutely no accusations, because, quite frankly, in spite of the wonderful historical knowledge of the hon. Prime Minister, he can go back so far and tell us what happened in various Liberal governments of years and years ago, the only reason I am interested in past history of any government, whether it be Conservative or Liberal, is so we might endeavour to find mistakes that many of them have made to benefit the government of today or tomorrow.

As far as the fishing industry is concerned, I am making no accusations, I have not the slightest idea whose fault it is, but I do make it very, very clear, that the fishing industry in our particular area, and, no doubt, in many areas of this province—the commercial fishing—has fallen off.

When I was home over the week-end, I was going to go to the fish house, and bring down a lamprey eel. I do not know whether or not that is within the rules of the House, but I was going to bring it down, so you could see it. Probably 80 per cent. of you have seen one, but, on the other hand, perhaps some of you have not.

There is no doubt but what this eel coming in from the ocean has really "fixed" the fishing industry. That is not the correct word to use, but it has

destroyed the fishing industry. Many, many people who have commercial fishing licences are not going to bother setting their nets next spring.

In this particular instance, I was rather amazed at reading in the *Hansard* of the House of Commons debates, the official record of January 16, 1956. The Federal Government has set up a commission in order to try to eradicate this menace which is knocking these poor fishermen completely off their feet.

Since Ontario is the only province on the Great Lakes, they had the right to put 3 members on that commission, together with members from the 8 states of the United States which are on the Great Lakes.

I wish to read to you for a moment, the remarks of Mr. Murphy, the member for Lambton West. I am wondering if after I finish reading this, the two hon. members from Lambton here today will agree with these statements. Mr. Murphy is referring to one of the appointments the Ontario Government made to this particular commission, which reads as follows:

Since that time an International Joint Committee has been set up on which there are 3 Canadian members. In fact, they are 3 Ontario members because only one province in Canada is on the Great Lakes. There are also 3 representatives from the United States representing the 8 states bordering on the Great Lakes.

I believe the personnel of that committee was announced early in December, and I was rather amazed to find there the name of one particular man. I was dumbfounded to think that the Minister would have chosen him because we had been in contact with this particular individual, Mr. Harkness of Toronto, a civil service employee of the Ontario Government, during a meeting of the fishermen of the Sarnia district and through certain newspaper articles.

I recall quite well having urged a sort of double flank movement to eradicate the lamprey menace and suggested that not only should we

meet the attack in Lake Superior but also in Lake Huron because otherwise we would suffer a \$5 million loss annually until the menace was eradicated.

We urged that the hatchery at Point Edward be kept open and we found that this particular member of the committee, who had not been appointed at that time, declared to the Press in a newspaper article that restocking the lakes was like spitting in the ocean.

He should be an authority on "spitting in the ocean," because that is all he has been doing for the last 10 or 12 years to preserve the fishing industry in the Great Lakes.

In the meantime, the trout fishing industry is being eliminated and the fishermen are going broke. In my end of Lake Huron, some of the fishermen are not even going to set out their nets in the spring.

I do not know Mr. Harkness at all. I do not know whether that statement made by the Conservative member for Lambton West in the Federal House of Commons is correct or not. I am merely offering it to the hon. members to show that perhaps something has not been done in the past about our fishing industry which should have been done; it has not been looked after as well as it should have been. I do hope that this government, or whoever has the say in this thing, will co-operate with the Federal Government and attempt to see that this lamprey menace is done away with.

I remember only 15 or so years ago that the Town of Meaford, which is in the riding of the hon. Minister of Health, used to have 40 or 50 boats take tourists out trolling for lake trout. Last year, I do not think there was a single one. There may have been one or two, but to all intents and purposes, the whole industry has been eradicated because of the lamprey.

I do hope, and I am sure they will liaison with the Federal Government and try to see this thing through, not to destroy the lamprey eel just in Lake

Superior, but in all the Great Lakes, so that these people who have devoted their life efforts to the fishing industry can once again set out their nets and make a respectable living.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not speak for a moment on agricultural questions, because, after all, my County of Bruce is a great agricultural county. I think it is most unfortunate that it is the only industry of this whole Dominion of Canada and more particularly in Ontario—except for the wheat growers in the west—it is the only one which has not risen with the times.

To all intents and purposes, at the present time, with the cost of machinery and so forth, and the lowering prices on cattle and hogs, the farmers in this province are back where they were in 1930. This is most unfortunate. I am sure I have no solution whatsoever. The only solution I can see is this; we can talk about “balances” and “helping out” this, that, and the other thing, but the only solution as far as I am concerned, is that this great country of ours, with all its natural resources, is increased population, and I am sure all hon. members of the House will agree when I say that this country is sadly lacking in population.

We must try by all possible means to get immigrants here who will pick up our Canadian way of life.

Many times have I heard people most foolishly say, “Why bring in immigrants from Europe, England and so forth, because we have unemployment now.” Surely the hon. members of this House are all realistic enough to know when you have twice as many people in the country, you need twice as much butter and twice as much meat, and to the manufacturers I say that you use twice as many suits of clothes and twice as many boots and shoes.

What I think we should do is, to try and get immigrants in here of whom we can be proud, and by all means raise our population so these huge food surpluses, to some extent at least, may be consumed by ourselves.

I have heard hon. members, particularly city people, complain about what

is being done to the farmers in the butter situation. I do not think the farmers of this province have to make any apology to any type of industry or any type of service in the whole country, when we think that the dairy industry of this country means so much and is so important.

For instance, in my own County of Bruce, there were between \$2 million and \$4 million paid to these farmers just for the cream which went into butter. If there was not price support on such a staple thing as butter, then the whole farming industry would go right down. It costs the Federal Government only approximately \$3.5 million, or thereabouts, to support butter, and I say to you that this money is very well spent.

Some of the hon. members from the city may have voters who in discussing these problems say, “Why should we help to support the farmer?” But I ask the hon. members present, “Why should the farmer help to support the gold mines in northern Ontario?” This country is built on a co-operative way of doing things, and I say when any particular industry starts hitting bottom, it is up to all of us to get together and give them a little lift.

I remember only about two weeks ago hearing people say, “Why should we send 10 million pounds of butter over to Holland?” or something like that. “Why do we not give it to our own people for 37 cents, instead of paying 60 cents?”

Surely, you realize if you throw butter on the market in Ontario at 37 cents a pound, the whole price structure would go, the whole industry would fall, and the farming industry is too important to let that happen. The price has been set at a level and we in this particular instance are helping our farmers, and the farmers on their part, are helping out the gold miners.

Let me talk for a moment about how they help industry. There is no such thing as unemployment insurance for a farmer, but I think you know the Federal Government puts so much money into the treasury, we put money in, an individual puts a little bit in and



the money the Federal Government puts in is taken from your pocket and mine and the farmer's pocket, but the farmer gets no use out of it whatsoever, except that it helps to keep up the financial end of this whole country.

I hope you will go back to those people who criticize the farmers, and stick up for the farmers, because they are really in bad shape. I have not one single idea as to how we can help them, because you cannot even give this food away in many instances. I say we should get more people in here to eat our butter, to drink our milk, to eat our beef and pork, and carry on from there.

Another thing I must say, Mr. Speaker, before I close, is that when I was going around my riding before the election, I, like the hon. member for Bellwoods, who spoke on Friday, met many old-age pensioners who were most perturbed, and who are really in trying circumstances. I, like the hon. member, made them a promise that I would raise this matter in the House. There is nothing I can do except air it to you, as hon. members did earlier.

In my address this afternoon, I said that what all of us were trying to do was to make a little better place for our children and for our grandchildren, but, Mr. Speaker, what about our fathers and our grandfathers? I feel most strongly that a country, and particularly a province which is as wealthy as ours, should help out our old people by every possible means available.

I am not suggesting the government has not helped them out in the past, and does not now, but I wish to be fair, and surely a government which can get an extra \$10 million out of liquor profits, which they did not even know they were going to get until the statement came down, could apportion some or in fact, all of that money towards supplementing the old-age pensions, as has been done in other provinces of this great Dominion. I know the hon. Prime Minister is thinking this over. I know perfectly well that the government with its huge financial commitments, has to consider this, knowing this money does not just grow on trees,

or anything like that, but it seems to me that if it is humanly possible at all, our old-age pensioners should be better looked after, particularly in this wealthy province.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): That is the way I feel, being one of them.

MR. WHICHER: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Minister think he needs it? I am sure he does not look as if he does.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing of which I must speak and about which we have heard so much lately. I might say I was very much surprised and indeed quite honoured when the hon. Prime Minister mentioned my thoughts on "health insurance" the other day, and I want to assure him that I appreciated it very much.

Before I say anything about it, I wish to go on record by saying that I am absolutely 100 per cent. without any reservation whatsoever, in favour of health insurance.

I realize there are great problems to which reference was made by the last hon. member who spoke, as far as setting up the administration, collecting premiums, and so forth. But I want to remind all the hon. members of the House that this health insurance idea did not just arise yesterday; it has been going on for quite some time, and I think the hon. Prime Minister—giving him all the necessary time, within reason—should be able to make up his mind whether we are going to have it or whether we are not.

In the meantime, what I am more interested in than anything else, as far as health is concerned, are those cases where an act of God comes in, and hits a certain family which may have 3 or 4 serious illnesses in one particular year, which very often results in the head of the family being financially ruined for life.

I am thinking of a particular incident where a child contracted a terrible blood disease. The head of the household had complete Blue Cross coverage, but already that child has cost him over

\$4,000. Last fall his little girl contracted rheumatic fever and had to go to the hospital, and two weeks later he himself fell off a tractor and broke his leg.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we were put on this earth, particularly in a rich province like Ontario, to have to "take" things like that. These were instances where surely all of us would like to help out; those are the ones which really hurt.

While the hon. Prime Minister very kindly, in his remarks, said they had gone into it 100 per cent., there was the question of administration difficulties, and I suggest this—and I may be entirely wrong but, believe you me, this is given sincerely—that the co-operative insurance agencies in this province, of which there are quite a number, do things a little differently than the Blue Cross.

In connection with the co-operative agencies, where a person becomes ill, the bill must be sent to the co-operative, which, in turn, sends a cheque to the hospital. With the Blue Cross, of course, it is the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we take a figure, whatever this province can afford—because I am not going to say we should pay amounts such as a \$50 medical expense—but let us take a reasonable figure. Let us suppose, just for argument's sake, that we take the figure \$500, which means that one spending anything over \$500 in any one particular year in any one particular family would receive governmental help. Why could it not be done this way?

Supposing the bill was \$1,500; why could not the \$1,500 bill be sent to the province, and a cheque in turn sent to the hospital for \$1,000 by the government, from monies contributed by the individual tax-payers of this great province of ours?

That is the only thing, in my opinion, where we have not security in this whole country today. We have such things as family allowances, pensions, unemployment insurance for the work-

ers, and so forth. But there is one thing which disturbs me, and that is—what would happen if I contracted a serious illness? What would happen if I become ill, and am forced to incur an expenditure of \$5,000 or \$6,000?

Of course, there are some people who will not pay it, but I think the majority of the people of this province are honest, and will work for the rest of their lives, perhaps, to pay off this huge amount.

I know the hon. Prime Minister has thought about this, because he has said so, and I would urge him to look into this matter of catastrophic insurance. I am not worried about the small hospital bills, but when it gets into higher figures, I wonder what would happen.

I am sure that all hon. members know of several cases where tragedy has struck a family, and I, as an individual tax-payer, would certainly like to help these people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say I certainly have appreciated the hospitality and friendliness which has been given to me by the hon. members of the government; particularly would I like to pay tribute to one who is right next door to me, the hon. Minister of Health, who has been very kind, as, indeed, have all of the other hon. Ministers of the Crown. They have said to me: "While we are together in this House, we will work together."

Of course they say, "When election time comes, we will do everything in our power to beat you," but in this, Mr. Speaker, remember they have taken the initiative. While I may get a few calls on this, very humbly I would like to suggest to the hon. members of the government when next election time comes around, I will do everything in my power to beat them.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, at last we have a man of courage in that little Party opposite.

MR. WHICHER: In the meantime, Mr. Provincial Secretary, may I say that we will work together here.

I do not think I have anything further to say, as there will no doubt be other occasions when things which should be said may be said.

Mr. Murdoch moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) : Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to move the adjournment of the House. I understand there is some entertainment which affects a number of the hon. members of the House, and

I think it would be more desirable to adjourn now rather than to have another hon. member commence speaking, which might take up a little time.

We will continue the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.50 of the clock p.m.







# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Tuesday, February 14, 1956**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>Public Lands Amendment Act, 1956</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading                                 | 209      |
| <b>Provincial Parks Act, 1954</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....                                 | 210      |
| <b>Assessment Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading .....   | 210      |
| <b>Mining Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, first reading .....  | 210, 211 |
| <b>Presentation of report</b> , Mr. Dunbar .....   | 211      |
| <b>Public Schools Act</b> , Bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading .....  | 211      |
| <b>Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne</b> , Mr. Daley, Mr. Grossman,<br>Mr. Elliott, Mr. Brandon ..... | 211      |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate</b> , Mr. Brandon, agreed to .....   | 242      |
| <b>Motion to adjourn</b> , Mr. Porter, agreed to .....   | 242      |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE PUBLIC LANDS AMENDMENT ACT, 1956

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Lands Amendment Act, 1956."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said:

Section 1: original survey lines and posts sometimes become obliterated, and replacement surveys are not justified because of the cost involved. In areas where little or no land has been alienated, it is both economical and practical to annul the original surveys. Subsequent surveys in such areas will be made only where land therein is disposed of. In these cases the land will be described in relation to a determined township boundary.

Section 2: the section as re-enacted will be confined to the sale or lease of

public lands not otherwise provided for in the Act or the regulations. In addition, the power under the present section is limited to 5-acre parcels; this is increased to 10-acre parcels.

Section 3: the new section will enable a person in possession of any public lands for more than 60 years to obtain quit claim letters patent.

Section 4: the section as re-enacted will require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the case of a sale of public lands covered by water.

Section 5: the subsection as re-enacted will require an owner to be an actual settler before he can obtain the pine on his land without payment therefor. The requirement that the owner reside on or within 10 miles of the land is reduced to 3 miles, and a fee of \$25 is fixed for an order releasing the land from a reservation of pine trees.

Section 6: the section as amended is confined to the release of road reservations in letters patent for land in a municipality.

Section 7: this new section will provide for the issue of certificates as to reservations in letters patent that are void by Statute. A fee of \$15 is prescribed for every such certificate. This amendment is complementary to amendments to be made to The Land Titles Act.

Sections 8, 9 and 10: these sections make void certain obsolete provisos and reservations in certain letters patent.

## THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT, 1954

Hon. Mr. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act, 1954."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said:

Section 1: the meaning of the term "provincial parks" is extended to include the comparatively small units known as provincial camp-grounds, provincial picnic-grounds, and the like.

Section 2: the new section 22a expresses the principle that unless a person can come within one of the exceptions provided in the regulations he cannot use or occupy public lands in a provincial park.

Section 3: the new section 23a provides for the seizure and confiscation of articles used in violation of the Act or the regulations. A similar provision is to be found in The Game and Fisheries Act and other Acts.

The new section 23b gives the district forester or superintendent in charge of a provincial park clear authority to open or close to travel any road or trail in the park, other than a road or trail under the control of The Department of Highways.

Another new section, 23c, authorizes the Minister to make agreements with respect to the establishment and operation of concessions and the like on public lands in provincial parks.

Sections 4 and 5: these sections bring into the Act certain principles applicable to prospecting, staking out claims and carrying on mining operations in provincial parks which heretofore have been dealt with in the regulations. These changes are designed to overcome some difficulties experienced in administration.

## THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: These are the usual amendments to The Assessment Act. For the most part they have been recommended by municipalities or by municipal associations.

MR. OLIVER: How many amendments are there?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There are about 28 or 30. Possibly on second reading I might elaborate on some of the more important amendments. Of course, there will be sufficient opportunity in the Committee on Municipal Law for everyone to have a look at them.

## THE MINING ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said:

Section 1, section 39a: this new section is complementary to The Provincial Parks Act, 1954. Regulations made under that Act regulate and control prospecting, mining, etc., in provincial parks. See Ontario Regulations 148/55.

Section 56a: the Minister of Lands and Forests under The Forest Fires Prevention Act may close a fire district owing to extremely hazardous fire conditions therein. This order prohibits persons from entering the closed district.

This new subsection is designed to discourage persons from ignoring such orders and staking out claims in closed districts.

Section 2: the new subsections 2a and 2b provide a practical procedure for cancelling "filed only" applications if no action is taken within the prescribed time, thus clearing the record.

The new subsection 5 sets out what has been the practice for many years, but which has been questioned lately.

Section 3, subsections 1 and 2: provision is made for allowing an extension before forfeiture occurs on the same basis as now allowed after forfeiture occurs.

Section 4: the words are added as an additional safety measure.

This will be referred to the Committee on Mining.

### THE MINING ACT

Hon. Mr. Kelly moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to abolish the Mining Court of Ontario.

Such jurisdiction as is now vested in the Mining Court can be exercised by a new officer (to be called "Mining Commissioner" and appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council) to whom the jurisdiction is transferred.

The provisions of the Bill are self-explanatory.

This Bill also will be referred to the Committee on Mining.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The 10th Annual Report of The Department of Travel and Publicity, Ontario, for the calendar year 1955.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

### THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Dana Porter in the absence of hon. Mr. Dunlop moves second reading of Bill No. 55, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. OLIVER: Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer say anything about this?

HON. MR. PORTER: This Bill will be referred to the Committee on Education, which meets tomorrow morning. The Bill deals with a number of sections of The Public Schools Act which are proposed to be amended. They deal largely with procedural matters, and probably could be discussed better in committee of the whole House, when it will be considered section by section, after it has been discussed in the Committee on Education. I forget whether the hon. Minister outlined exactly what the Bill contains when he introduced it, but I think the notes given are self-explanatory.

### THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, In rising to participate in this address on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to say to you how pleased I was, after your long and splendid service in the interests of the people of this province, that you have been elected as the Speaker of this House. Knowing you very well for a goodly number of years I believe you will fulfil your duties in a very efficient manner, and with all the dignity appertaining to your high office.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say—following what the hon. Prime Minister said in regard to the leader of the Opposition—that I also am glad to see him back. Prior to the election, the waves seemed to be rolling up so much that it for a time appeared possible that the genial leader of the Opposition might not be back with us.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): We heard the same thing about you.

HON. MR. DALEY: We are very happy that he is back, and I feel sure he will continue to do the best he can, with the little bit he has left with which to work.

When I hear him speaking about what more we should do for municipalities,



and how we should do this and that, I often recall—as possibly he does also—many years ago when he was the Minister of Labour in the government of which he was a member, my coming here with a delegation from St. Catharines, seeking to secure a little more help. It was during the bad days for the citizens there. The delegation received a very kindly and sympathetic hearing, shall I say, but nothing else.

It often strikes me that the hon. leader of the Opposition should reminisce a little, when he is thinking of how much should be done for municipalities, and recall what was added by his government in those days was very little.

Mr. Speaker, now I come to the leader of the CCF Party.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not say too much about him.

HON. MR. DALEY: I have been surprised at the attitude he has exhibited during the early stages of this session. I would like to recall to him that in the period from 1943 to 1945, his CCF Party seemed to be “on the march”.

MR. MacDONALD: We will be on the march again.

HON. MR. DALEY: The other Parties then seemed to be getting food for thought.

MR. MacDONALD: We are still giving you food for thought.

HON. MR. DALEY: In 1945, the CCF candidate in my riding that day polled about 10,000 votes. That caused a little bit of a scare. Then, this unrealistic attitude which has been exhibited by the Party throughout the years began to impress itself on the people. The next time the same man ran he polled only 5,000 votes, and in the next election the CCF candidate polled only 2,000 votes.

MR. MacDONALD: You are gloating.

HON. MR. DALEY: That was done in spite of your best efforts to get a man with the same name as the federal candidate. I would suggest to the leader of the CCF—

MR. MacDONALD: Is this advice No. 3? Is it free of charge?

HON. MR. DALEY: I suggest that the hon. member turn around and look at his colleague, who sits directly behind him, and follow his example. As the hon. Provincial-Secretary has said, the CCF members, generally speaking, have been “overnight guests” here. I am afraid that if the CCF continue with the attitude they have adopted here, that is what they will continue to be. If the hon. member follows the example set by his colleague sitting behind him—

MR. MacDONALD: Do you want me to smile all the time?

HON. MR. DALEY: In regard to the wonderful contribution he has made in this debate, and his approaches to matters being discussed in this House, the hon. member might hang on a little longer. We are not unhappy about it—

MR. MacDONALD: You are unhappy about me?

HON. MR. DALEY: It might be a good thing if the hon. member could stay, because certainly, up to this moment, he has not added very much to the prestige of the CCF Party.

MR. MacDONALD: You will see.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, of necessity, I want to speak more or less briefly on the labour situation, The Labour Relations Act, and how it affects the situation in this province. I have some notes and some statistics for Ontario for 1955. My statement is factual, and lengthy, and I am not going to read it in full, but I will submit it to *Hansard* in its complete form.

The strike situation in Ontario in 1955 was dominated by a few major disputes. The strike in 5 General

Motors' plants was the longest, involved the largest number of workers, and therefore resulted in the most time loss. Alone, this strike accounted for 62 per cent. of the time lost in industrial disputes in the province last year, and almost 32 per cent. of all workers involved in strikes in Ontario were employed by this one company.

As Table 1 shows, this strike, together with those at DeHavilland Aircraft, and Canada Wire and Cable Company, accounted for 78 per cent. of all time lost, and just under 40 per cent. of all workers involved in industrial disputes in the province.

It should also be kept in mind that the total figures for Ontario in 1955 are swollen somewhat by the Ford Motor strike, which continued almost to the end of January, 1955, and therefore

added to the time loss and the total number of workers involved in strikes during 1955.

In spite of these 3 lengthy strikes, and the carry-over of the Ford strike into 1955, both the number of workers involved in strikes and the total time loss in 1955 are well below the corresponding figures for 1946.

In that year, time loss due to strikes amounted to 2,330,486 man-working days, as compared with 1,587,556 man-working days in 1955, while the number of workers involved in strikes in Ontario in 1955 totalled 43,341, as compared with 48,796 in 1946. Since 1946, of course, the labour force in Ontario has expanded considerably, and the number of union members and the number under collective agreement have also increased very substantially.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF WORKERS INVOLVED, AND TIME LOSS IN MAN-WORKING DAYS,  
IN 3 MAJOR STRIKES IN ONTARIO, 1955

| Name of strike               | No. of workers<br>involved | Time loss in<br>man-working<br>days in 1955 | No. of<br>workers | Time loss |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------|
|                              |                            |   | %                 | %         |
| DeHavilland Aircraft .....   | 1,940                      | 168,000                                     | 4.5               | 10.6      |
| General Motors .....         | 13,800                     | 990,000                                     | 31.8              | 62.4      |
| Canada Wire and Cable .....  | 1,349                      | 84,745                                      | 3.1               | 5.3       |
| TOTAL, 3 major strikes ..... | 17,089                     | 1,242,745                                   | 39.4              | 78.3      |
| TOTAL, Ontario .....         | 43,341                     | 1,587,556                                   |                   |           |

NOTE: All figures for 1955 are preliminary. The information is taken from the monthly reports on strikes and lockouts in the *Labour Gazette*. Information for December, for time loss in the Canada Wire and Cable and General Motors strikes was estimated from the data provided in the weekly confidential report on strikes provided by the federal Department of Labour.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STRIKES, NUMBER OF WORKERS INVOLVED, AND TOTAL TIME  
LOSS IN ONTARIO, 1953, 1954 AND 1955

| Year              | No. of<br>strikes | No. workers<br>involved | Time loss man-<br>working days | Percentage of total for Canada |             |           |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
|                   |                   |                         |                                | Strikes                        | No. workers | Time loss |
| 1953              | 85                | 26,261                  | 608,275                        | 48.9                           | 46.9        | 45.9      |
| 1954              | 86                | 30,555                  | 828,882                        | 49.5                           | 49.1        | 56.2      |
| 1955 <sup>1</sup> | 81                | 43,341                  | 1,587,556                      | 54.7                           | 75.4        | 85.1      |

<sup>1</sup>1955 figures are preliminary. The data for the two previous years is taken from the *Annual Report on Strikes and Lockouts*, published by the federal Department of Labour. Figures for 1955 have been compiled from the monthly reports on strikes and lockouts, published in the *Labour Gazette*, and are subject to revision.

Since last year was apparently relatively peaceful as far as industrial relations were concerned throughout the rest of the country, it is natural that the few lengthy strikes in Ontario should raise the proportion of time lost in Ontario to total time lost in the whole of Canada.

As Table 2 shows, the time lost in Ontario amounted to 85 per cent. of the total time lost through strike action in the country as a whole, while 75 per cent. of the number of workers involved in strikes were in the Ontario jurisdiction. This of course is a very unusual situation, though one would naturally expect the number of workers involved in strikes, and total time loss in Ontario, to be a relatively high proportion of the total, since it is a highly industrialized province with a very large proportion of the total union membership.

The proportions of time loss and workers involved in Ontario to totals for Canada shown in Table 2, for 1953 and 1954, are much closer to the normal situation.

TABLE 3  
PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS  
INVOLVED IN STRIKES TO TOTAL  
WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS,  
CANADA AND ONTARIO  
JURISDICTION

| <i>Year</i>                   | <i>Ontario jurisdiction</i> | <i>Canada</i> |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 1941                          | 3.1                         | 3.4           |
| 1942                          | 3.0                         | 4.1           |
| 1943                          | 3.6                         | 7.5           |
| 1944                          | 3.2                         | 2.6           |
| 1945                          | 4.7                         | 3.3           |
| 1946                          | 5.0                         | 4.7           |
| 1947                          | 1.7                         | 3.3           |
| 1948                          | 1.3                         | 1.3           |
| 1949                          | 2.6                         | 1.6           |
| 1950                          | 3.6                         | 5.6           |
| 1951                          | 5.3                         | 2.8           |
| 1952                          | 3.2                         | 3.2           |
| 1953                          | 2.0                         | 1.4           |
| 1954                          | 2.3                         | 1.6           |
| 1955                          | 3.1                         | 1.4           |
| Average, 1941-1944            | 3.2                         | 4.5           |
| 1945-1947                     | 3.7                         | 3.8           |
| 1948-1955                     | 2.9                         | 2.3           |
| GENERAL AVERAGE,<br>1941-1955 | 3.0                         | 3.1           |

Table 3 represents an attempt to estimate the incidence of strikes in Ontario, and in Canada as a whole, by comparing the percentage of workers involved in strikes to the total number of wage and salary workers. For this purpose an estimate was prepared of wage and salary workers in the Ontario jurisdiction, based on the data provided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, but eliminating as far as possible the employees of industries falling within the federal jurisdiction who work in Ontario.

As the table shows, there have been several years since 1941, when the incidence of strikes in Ontario, as measured in this manner, has been considerably below that for the country as a whole. During the war years, 1941-44, the average percentage of workers on strike in Ontario to total wage and salary workers was considerably lower than for the country as a whole, and it was also slightly below the general average in the immediate postwar (1945-1947), in spite of the difficulties in the transition year 1946.

In that year, 5 per cent. of the wage and salary workers in the Ontario jurisdiction were involved in strikes, as compared with only 3 per cent. in 1955. This latter percentage is higher than for the country as a whole, as might be expected in view of the unusual situation in 1955 in Ontario, and this has of course tended to push up the average for the Ontario jurisdiction for the years 1948-1955 to a level somewhat higher than the average for the whole of Canada.

Nevertheless, for the whole period covered in the table, 1941 to 1955 inclusive, the percentage of workers involved in strikes to wage and salary workers in the Ontario jurisdiction is just slightly below that for the whole of Canada. This would indicate that over the whole period since 1941, the incidence of strikes in the Ontario jurisdiction has compared very favourably with that of the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the department of government I have had the honour to administer for over 12 years is a contentious one as it deals with human



relations, people, their aims and objects, their desires, their health, welfare, safety and the relationship between management and labour.

It is always open to criticism, some good, some bad. To me, the criticism is good, as it has the effect of keeping those responsible for administration continually alert to changing conditions.

Suggestions have been made that would give to organized labour almost complete control of industry, control of production, eliminate what I consider to be management rights and would I believe gradually, if not immediately, destroy incentive to invest capital and remove that competitive spirit that prevails in industry not only for management but for labour as well.

This Labour Relations Act is not, in my opinion, framed to be dictatorial in character, that tells industry and labour what they must do. Rather it is a set of rules to govern the play, a levelling influence designed to assist labour and management. It charts a course which, if followed, in a majority of cases leads to settlement and mutual understanding. The records disclose this. It certainly was never intended to prevent the worker from endeavouring to improve his position, nor to demand that industry accept conditions which they feel they cannot live with.

On the other hand, you have suggestions that would endeavour to curb the rights of labour, prohibit strikes, take away from organized labour their constitutional rights.

I am not impressed with either of these as being practical solutions of the problem. I believe, and, as I am not infallible I could be wrong, that the worker dissatisfied with his employment, his working conditions, or his remuneration should—after following the legal procedures as laid down by The Labour Relations Act, which require first negotiation by the parties, conciliation by an officer of the department, a conciliation board, which consists of a member selected by each party to the dispute and an impartial chairman—have the right to discontinue to work under the conditions about which he is

not satisfied. I would never be a party to taking away this right from him. Unions have, in my opinion, established themselves as an important cog in the wheel of industry.

Mr. Speaker, recently while endeavouring to get two parties together, I had to ask management, in the course of the discussion—and this was really a sizeable industry—if it was their intention to try to destroy this union; because certainly I was going to advise them against it.

Management said, "No, Mr. Minister, that is not our intention. In our industry we could not operate without the union; we must have a union." I think that is a pretty generally-accepted principle in connection with municipal affairs.

MR. MacDONALD: Industry said the same thing, but destroyed it by section 78, when they tried to organize in the municipal field.

HON. MR. DALEY: We opened every avenue for municipal employees to operate. It was this government which did that.

MR. MacDONALD: Then you take their rights away, by section 78.

HON. MR. DALEY: We opened every avenue for municipal employees to organize. Mr. Speaker, the organization of workers plays an important part in the scheme of things, for individually a man is very weak, but collectively he can be strong.

Sometimes, of course, this strength leads them into a position where they demand more as a right in the way of conditions and money than industry feels it can grant and at the same time remain stable. Then a strike ensues, and the length of the strike is determined by the ability of the negotiators to convince one or the other that the terms and conditions should be modified.

Over the years, I have been extremely fortunate in building up a conciliation service that is second to none anywhere. Mr. Fine's name—and, shall I say, fame—has spread across this country and

even into other countries. As chief conciliation officer, he has developed a staff in which we have the greatest confidence. Professor Finkelman, as chairman of the Labour Relations Board, has, in my opinion, no equal in that field, in this country or any other. We are indeed fortunate to have men of this calibre as administrators.

I am in constant consultation with these men concerning these problems as they arise. We are constantly reviewing the Act and the problems which come before us from time to time, and I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have no suggestion for any method which would change the principles of this Act. I will, however, at a later date, present for your consideration some amendments and additions designed to meet the present difficulties, and visualize in particular the contemplated amalgamation of the two big labour organizations, the AF of L and the CIO.

May I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1943 there existed what was at that time known as the "Labour Relations Court." This was very judicial in character, and representations were made both by labour and management to have this court changed, and so there came into being the "Labour Relations Board." This board is composed of an equal representation of management and labour, with an impartial chairman, and it has been operating since the change was effected.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this board—with, of course, the exception of one and possibly two deaths—has had very few changes in the personnel during its existence, and I would say they have done magnificent work in connection with the duties assigned to them.

I thought when this board was appointed, when organized labour increased its tempo and started to organize a great deal more effectively, that eventually the activities of the board would decrease. I think that was a natural assumption, that eventually the workers in this field would be organized, and certified as bargaining agents and the

work would gradually decrease, but that has not been the case.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment this board for another reason. We have labour and management sitting together, definitely top-flight men, and I would like to stress that it has demonstrated over the years the ability of both labour and management to sit down and agree in mutual understanding and good-will. That, of course, is quite possible. They have made a great contribution to the establishment of good labour relations in this province, and as such have been a guide and an example which most of the other provinces have followed.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the record a report which sets out what I have already said in connection with the activities of this board:

"By any standard, the year 1955 has been the busiest in the history of the Labour Relations Board. Last year, unions seeking to establish bargaining rights with employers through certification procedures under The Labour Relations Act filed a total of 843 applications with the board, 55 per cent. more than in 1954.

"This 1955 total of applications filed shatters the previous record of 671 such applications filed, established in 1951, and is in fact 37 per cent. above the number filed in 1946 when the first major post-war union organizing drive was under way.

"The sharp rise in applications for certification this year occurred at a time when applications for conciliation filed with the board were also at record levels. The board received a total of 1,321 conciliation applications during 1955, as compared with 1,095 in 1954 and 1,176 in 1953, the previous high point.

"Together with a total of 138 applications of other types filed (for termination of bargaining rights, consent to prosecute, for declaration that strikes or lock-outs are unlawful, etc.) this brought the grand total of applications filed to 2,302, as compared with 1,793

for the 12 months of 1954, and 1,837 in 1953.

"Though applications for conciliation form such a large proportion of the total applications filed with the board—"

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that when any organization wishes to apply for conciliation, they do not apply to the Minister, but they apply to The Labour Relations Board, which examines the request and can order the parties to go back and continue to negotiate, or can grant the application for conciliation.

"—they are more an indication of the pressure on the conciliation machinery than a really significant measure of the work-load of the board itself in this area, since the board does not provide conciliation services, but merely screens the applications.

"Under The Labour Relations Act it receives initially all applications for conciliation, and its main role in this field is to determine if the basic conditions set forth in the Act as necessary to the granting of conciliation services have been fulfilled—chiefly, that the application is timely, and that the parties themselves have made reasonable efforts to reach an agreement.

"If the board finds that the parties have not bargained it may direct them to meet together and attempt to reach an agreement before referring the case to the Minister. If the board finds that the basic conditions have been complied with, it refers the application to the Minister of Labour, who then appoints a conciliation officer.

"The major function of the board, however, is the administration of the certification procedures under the Act, so that any sharp increase in applications for certification such as has occurred this year means a greatly increased work-load.

"As far as certifications are concerned, the pattern for the year began to emerge in the early months of 1955. Applications for certification rose rapidly in the first quarter, and by the

end of March the total for the first 3 months was very close to the previous record for that period in the year set in the first quarter of 1951. In April alone, 89 applications for certification were filed, the largest number in a single month since the 1950 Act came into operation, and a high level was maintained throughout the spring.

"Usually, applications for certification drop quite sharply in the summer months, but this year there was only a moderate slackening, and in the fall applications for certification continued to flow into the board at a rate approaching that of the second quarter. This also is in contrast to the experience of previous years, when it has been usual for applications for certification in the fall months to run from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. below the spring peak.

"By conducting many more hearings and executive sessions, the board has succeeded in keeping pace with this greatly increased flow of applications for certification. Including a substantial number carried over from the previous year, the board disposed of 851 certification applications in 1955, 79 per cent. more than in 1954. Seventy per cent. of these applications were granted, and the remainder were either dismissed or withdrawn by leave of the board.

"To a considerable extent, the sharp increase in the board's activity reflects an organizing drive in the construction industry, and this in turn may well be linked to last year's marked expansion in construction.

"Well over a quarter—or 27 per cent.—of the applications for certification granted by the board last year involved employees and firms in construction industry. All types of construction projects were represented, including commercial and industrial buildings, residential construction and special trade contractors in the electrical, carpentry, plumbing and heating, and sheet metal trades. In addition, there were a number of certifications for construction workers on projects connected with the St. Lawrence Seaway.



"This high proportion of certifications in the construction industry is a relatively new development. In 1951, fewer than 10 per cent. of the certification applications granted by the board involved workers in the construction industry, while in 1946 certifications granted in the construction industry were less than 1 per cent. of the total, and entirely confined to special trade contractors.

"The board's certification procedures had originally been developed largely in relation to the more stable working force in manufacturing industries, and in 1946 it had not found a way to adjust them to the special problems presented by the construction industry, particularly the rapid rate of labour turnover on construction projects, and the marked seasonal fluctuations in employment.

"In recent years, the board has made considerable progress in devising procedures to take account of the general characteristics of the industry. But many problems remain to be resolved, not the least of them being the unfamiliarity of some of the smaller contractors with board procedures and practices.

"Logging in northern Ontario is another new area in which certification procedures are being applied, though as yet the number of applications involving workers in this industry is quite small compared to major groups like construction and manufacturing.

"Like the construction industry, however, logging poses difficult procedural and technical problems, since logging even more than construction is subject to sharp seasonal fluctuations and rapid labour turnover.

"Furthermore, the inaccessibility of many of the logging camps, and the traditional system of sub-contracting in use in many areas, have further complicated the certification procedures as applied to this industry.

"As might be expected in a highly industrialized province, by far the largest number of certifications granted in 1955 involve workers in manufacturing. However, the number of applications for certification granted in manu-

facturing industries in 1955 is somewhat smaller than in previous years, with the result that the percentage of certifications in manufacturing is down considerably."

This has been going on for many years, and the activities of this board in certifying are eventually coming to the point where the province has been well covered, but however, new activities of organizers have extended into these smaller groups, some of them with as few as two or three employees, which are being organized.

"Thus, certifications granted involving employees in manufacturing establishments were 40 per cent. of the total granted in 1955, as compared with 58 per cent. in 1951 and 53 per cent. in 1946.

"The character of the applications for certification in manufacturing has also been changing over the past years. For one thing, the size of the bargaining unit tends to be smaller than in 1951, and a great deal smaller than in 1946, when certifications were granted for employees in many of the large manufacturing firms in the province.

"One reason for the smaller size of the unit is the fact that a substantial number of certifications granted involve such groups as stationary engineers in manufacturing firms or drivers in the depots of the large bakeries scattered throughout the province, rather than employees engaged in the actual manufacturing process.

"Aside from these groups, the bulk of the other certifications granted in manufacturing industries were for employees in smaller manufacturing firms such as sawmills, veneer plants, small metal fabricating and appliance plants, and plants producing such items as television parts.

"About one-fifth of the applications for certification granted during 1955 involve workers in the trade and transportation industries. This is roughly the same proportion of the total certifications granted as in 1951, though it is considerably lower than the proportion

in 1946. Most of the applications for certification granted in trade and transportation concern drivers and driver-salesmen in dairies and in small trucking and cartage firms, and clerks in retail food stores and wholesale establishments.

"The service industry was also fairly well represented, with just over 9 per cent. of the total applications for certification granted in 1955 involving workers in this industry. Most of these employees were non-professional workers in hospitals, workers employed by municipal corporations, and employees of dry-cleaning establishments."

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to read that because it indicates what is happening in this province with every type of worker from those in the woods and hospitals and similar industries, which have gradually organized themselves into a union of some sort. But as these organizations first had to be certified, and conciliation procedure set up, it can be easily seen that great problems have been confronting The Department of Labour.

From time to time—in 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954 and 1955—amendments to the Act have been adopted, necessitated by actual administration, looking toward the correcting of weaknesses, rules, practices and procedures established, and so forth. This procedure has made The Labour Relations Act, as it exists today, one of the finest possible of that type of legislation to be found anywhere.

This has been accomplished, not by a hit-and-miss procedure, but by a continuing examination of difficulties as they present themselves, and concerning their problems, and a sincere endeavour to find answers to them.

Mr. Speaker, there is one matter which has been before the public for the last several months, and that is the difficulty in which one of the great industries, known as the General Motors, has found itself. I am sure that all hon. members are very happy at hearing the news that the strike had been concluded, and I may assure you, Mr. Speaker, that

I do not think anyone was more happy than I.

But I would just like to make a few comments on "big business" like the General Motors Corporation. Some people say, "Oh, big business" in a tone which would seem to indicate there was something wrong or something sinister about "big business." In my opinion, a business grows as large as its ability to sell its products. There is really no limit to our productive capacity, which can be increased at will, so the only restraint on business, whether it be a grocery store, a newspaper, or any other type of business, is its ability to produce economically and to sell its products.

But, Mr. Speaker, as business grows, so does its responsibilities to the many thousands of its workers, not only in its field, but workers in other plants, numbering sometimes many thousands occupied in the smaller plants which are being supported by "big business."

In the case of the General Motors, there is the steel industry, the glass industry, the fabric industry, the rubber industry, and countless smaller industries whose main support comes from the big industry, and its ability to produce satisfactory articles, whether it be—as in the case of this great company—diesel engines, refrigerators, or automobiles.

So while General Motors may have an estimated 17,000 of its own employees, it actually supports thousands more in various ways, and it has a great responsibility to those workers.

Then it also has a responsibility to its shareholders, the people who have invested their savings in the company, and who expect a reasonable return on their investments. So, as I have said, the responsibilities of a great industry are very great indeed. I have seen the General Motors in my home city grow from a very small plant, not so many years ago, then known as the McKinnon industry, to a great industry providing gainful employment for thousands of people. And that condition has happened not only in St. Catharines, but all over this province.

An industry has an obligation, as I have endeavoured to point out, to produce an article of a standard quality, and to produce in quantities which will enable those engaged in selling to sell its merchandise.

Then, on the other hand are the workers. They would be poor indeed if they were not continually striving to improve their working conditions, their remuneration, and their standards of living, to provide higher education for their children, and secure an opportunity to enjoy some of the finer things of life.

This is desirable and necessary and is basic to our continued prosperity. These two great forces in the automobile industry had their difficulties and they met "head on" and they have been endeavouring for months to settle their differences and have at last been successful.

Because of the numbers of men involved, and the effect of such a prolonged strike, the stoppage of production in such an important industry has an effect on the economy of the country.

But, let us look at the picture realistically; here is a great and powerful industry and, large as it is in this country, Mr. Speaker, it is probably 20 times as large in the United States, and while they may be separate and distinct units, what happens in the one definitely affects the other. All this had to be considered all through these negotiations.

The bargaining group in both units is the very powerful UAW, probably one of the strongest organizations of workers in this country. Throughout the years differences and grievances had developed, which were not all monetary matters, nor matters of wages, because, as you know, negotiations were carried out continually for months endeavouring to iron out differences such as job classification, seniority, insurance, pension and health differentials, differentials as between skilled and unskilled labour, apprenticeship training, and a host of others which the union felt was their right, and management felt was infringing on the right of the company to conduct its own affairs.

Clarification of all these things which had developed over the years had to be found which inevitably led to a "show-down." While the strike has been long and more severe than any one anticipated, yet I feel that now it is ended, it will have established a better understanding and will probably have a very salutary effect on the conduct of this great industry for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I say no legislation could have prevented this strike and no one but the parties themselves could settle the difficulties which had developed over the years. Top negotiators of both union and management have been continually at work and I am glad to know that a mutually satisfactory solution has been found. I believe now that it is over, because of the care and time that have been taken with every detail, the cure will be permanent.

A great many suggestions are made in the course of a year to myself, and the government, as to what should be done to correct and prevent such a catastrophe—and it was a catastrophe—from happening. Some people suggest compulsory arbitration.

We have considered compulsory arbitration many times and have spent many hours on it. Some say there should be compulsory arbitration for everything, others say for public utilities only. We have decided, in the light of experience in this country, with our citizens, our processes, our certification and conciliation procedures and requirements which are laid out in The Labour Relations Act, that compulsory arbitration is certainly not necessary.

Secondly, we feel that no one wants it. Who wants it? Certainly not industry nor organized labour. Neither party wishes to have their affairs placed in the hands of some outside party to decide for labour how they are going to work, or for management how much they are going to have to pay.

Then, of course, there is the difficulty of defining a "public utility," to what extent does it affect the general welfare and economy of the country? I think it would probably be very difficult to define what is a "public utility."



I recall at one time a comparatively small plant being on strike. They made a commodity that was very essential to the manufacturing of steel, and steel companies were pressing me to see if something could not be done to re-open the plant. If the strike had continued, and the steel companies had been forced to close because of the absence of the commodity this small industry made, would you call that small industry a "public utility"? I do not think it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to define a "public utility."

As I say, neither party to a dispute wants compulsory arbitration, because it takes away from them the right to administer their own affairs. There is only one place where these things can be settled satisfactorily, and that is at the conference table.

Some people seem to become panicky and "scary" if there is talk about a possible disruption of a hospital. They say we should have compulsory arbitration for hospitals.

There again, Mr. Speaker, I say our experience over a period of years has proven it is not necessary. When this government made it possible for the workers in a hospital to be organized, some people thought it was a bad thing to do, but may I say if ever a group of people needed organization to improve their conditions it was the workers in the hospitals, where they were underpaid, and working under conditions which at that time attracted only those who were nearly desperate.

Because of this organization, hospitals today are pretty generally organized and are attractive to a better type of employee.

Has there been a strike in a hospital in this province? There has not, and I doubt if there ever will be. I took the stand at that time with the organizers who were organizing hospital employees and I told them that at that time there was a government which was sympathetic, but that if they ever struck a hospital they would turn, not only the government, but the people of Ontario, against them and we would never stand

idly by and see the sick in hospitals left unattended.

I suggested to them they forget even considering striking a hospital, and they agreed that they never would—and they never have.

We have had many difficulties; we have had conciliation between hospital boards and the workers, but we have always been able, by persistence and with reasonableness on the part of both parties—the workers and the boards—to iron out those difficulties. Today we have better conditions in our hospitals, a better type of employee, and more satisfied workers, and I congratulate labour on the attitude it has displayed in this field.

We have also had the suggestion brought before us that it would be considered advisable to have a compulsory vote before a strike, or in the middle of a strike. Some people claim that a vote which had been taken was not done properly, that there was some interference with the workers expressing themselves, and all this sort of thing.

We hear all kinds of things but, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget their union has jurisdiction over the conduct of its affairs, it has a constitution, it elects its own bargaining committee, and if the members are not satisfied with the actions of a committee, they can get rid of it.

If, in the event they did decide to take a vote, what would you put on the ballot? What would have had to be included in the ballot in the General Motors strike? There were a hundred different things to be decided, some of them not monetary, but equally as important in the minds of the workers. How would you ever construct a ballot upon which you could get a straight "yes" or "no" from the workers? It would be an impossible thing to do.

In theory it might sound very good, because in every strike you hear: "Our people do not want to be out on strike, most of our men would go back to work tomorrow." Sure, they would go back to work under certain conditions, they do not want to be out on strike, nobody

does. But they still do not want to work under the conditions under which they were formerly working, and so there is a strike.

In theory it might sound like a good idea, but in practice it would accomplish nothing. Such a procedure would tie the hands of myself and my officials in The Department of Labour in attempting to settle disputes, which is done often at the last hour. No, Mr. Speaker, a compulsory vote is not the answer.

Often a company does not make its best offer prior to a strike, if they feel one is imminent, but they hold something back, and we know it, and often when we are able to settle a strike it is because we are able to get from a company that which they were holding back before the strike in order to settle it.

Everyone knows if the strike occurs it will go on until some change in the attitude of either party takes place, and so the company often reserves something on which to settle the strike, feeling there is going to be one. The unions likewise ask for more than they expect to receive and they are prepared to modify their demands a little in order to bring about a settlement. There is no such thing as a vote which would be satisfactory before a strike or even in the middle of one.

Conciliation is another thing which has come in for a great deal of criticism, criticizing time limits, delayed conciliation, and so on. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, you cannot put a definite time limit on when people will agree. It just cannot be done. I have had people in my own office say: "Mr. Minister, we have to get this settled by 6 o'clock tonight 'or else'."

To them I say, "You might just as well go home now because I cannot guarantee that I can iron out these difficulties by 6 o'clock tonight. If we start these proceedings, we stay here or we continue them until such time as I decide whether there will be a settlement or not."

You cannot set a time limit on these things. During the milk strike not so many years ago the negotiations were

held in my office for more than 3 days, and the last day we sat from 9 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock the next morning—all night along—because I felt there was an area of agreement in the picture if we could only find it.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, there is little delay in the Department of Labour in setting up a Conciliation Board once we have the application, and it is from there on that delays occur and I do not know that any one is to blame.

Industry, unfortunately, has developed a number of people who are, you might call them, "specialists" in this field, but there are only a limited number, and sometimes you will find the same people being appointed by an industry, where that industry has 3 or 4 boards sitting at the same time.

So it is with the unions. The unions have certain men whom they desire to have represent them on these boards, and it is often very difficult to arrange meetings. A week will go by and they just cannot get together, so there are delays.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we actually have requests to delay a Conciliation Board. Once a board has been appointed one side or the other will say, "We are dealing with another plant, and if we can reach an agreement there, I think we can settle this without a board, so will you just hold that up." We hear complaints of delay in these things, and yet often we are requested to delay them, and actually at times it is a good thing to delay them.

I have pointed out during the course of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, that the number of assignments to the conciliation services this year were 1,077; the number of agreements effected by my own conciliation officials were 624, or 58 per cent. of all cases without any trouble. There were 48 cases refused by myself under a recent amendment to the Act which places in the discretion of the Minister the right to refuse a board if he deems it advisable. This last year I have refused 48 cases, and in all those cases there was some reason for it.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, The Labour Relations Act as originally designed and further amended, has done a very good job. It may be of interest to know that our difficulties as of 1955 were only about half what they were in 1946, and we must take into consideration the greatly increased organization and the greatly increased industrial activity in this province.

The only way, in my opinion, that this labour legislation can be improved is by experience and sitting in at negotiations, seeing them at first hand, because every case is different. I think proper and careful thought is due this perplexing question, so that it will be understood that this Act, designed and formulated from experiences based on administrative experience by competent—I say again, extremely competent—public servants in this field, could not possibly be turned over to another body or commission.

There are plenty of competent and capable men, but they certainly would lack the actual experience which is necessary to deal with these problems. I am firmly convinced it is a governmental responsibility to establish the rules and regulations under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker, I say again we have good labour legislation in this province, and because of the excellent public servants we have, we have good administration.

MR. ALLAN GROSSMAN (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. members for Renfrew South and Sault Ste. Marie both did a very creditable job in their presentations.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Renfrew South on his election to this Legislature, not only because I know that he will make a valuable addition to this House, but also because of his success in the by-election, I, with other hon. members who were elected for the first time in the general election of 1955, now have automatically

graduated from the ranks of the “babies of the Legislature.” This makes me feel more of a veteran of the House than I otherwise might.

The hon. member for Renfrew South has, of course, proven that while he may be the “baby of the House” from the standpoint of service, he is certainly a healthy, robust one with a fine command of the Queen’s English.

I would also like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to the very honourable position which you now hold.

Mr. Speaker has been a friend of long standing, and there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that his pleasing personality, his sense of fairness and innate dignity will add lustre to the position which he holds.

As for myself, Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for York South insofar as they refer to membership in this hon. House, as being one of the most noble aims in life to which one can aspire. I am proud to be a member of this Legislature, but humble in the knowledge of the responsibilities which accompany that membership.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that because my riding was represented for 12 years by a Communist, it should not be thought that the people of the riding are sympathetic to the Communist cause. As in other areas, in some of the democratic states of the world, which are, or were, represented by Communists, my predecessor was able to gain election, and re-election, by the usual chicanery employed by Communists all over the world.

They manage, as the hon. members of this House are very well aware, to employ methods which create the impression, too often quite successfully, that they are champions of the common people, whereas we all know that they champion only one cause—the cause of the Communist Internationale.

Everything they do is done for the purpose of furthering the Communist Party, and for no other reason. Of course, the Communist who holds public



office entrenches himself by doing many little things and performing small services to gain the confidence of the people, in the hope that people will overlook his communistic loyalties. It is, Mr. Speaker, as if the Communist comes to a neighbour's assistance with a fire hose to put out a small fire in a part of the neighbour's building, in the hope that at the propitious moment he will be able to burn his neighbour's house down—or once having gained entrance to the house, he may be able to take ownership of it.

Also, Mr. Speaker, many so-called "intellectuals" have the feeling that Communists can be trusted and tolerated to a point as being enervated conscience-prodders, hoping, very foolishly, that they, the "intellectuals," will know when the danger point is reached.

The theory that you can elect one or two Communists without fearing that they could possibly gain enough membership to form a government is a rather ridiculous one.

Imagine what would happen if in 30 or 40 ridings where they had candidates, there were enough people who felt sympathetic to them. We would then be faced with a Party of 30 or 40 Communists in the House, and if the other Parties were split up evenly enough, these people would control the balance of power, and in fact have a great deal to do with government policy. As a matter of fact, this is exactly what is happening, and has happened, in many parts of the world today. In Czechoslovakia they ran under different banners, and finally took over the government. In other words, it's the old, stupid theory that "it cannot happen here."

I need only point out, Mr. Speaker, that this was the thinking which resulted in the election of Fred Rose to the federal House, a man who eventually did a great deal of damage to our country.

These so-called "intellectuals" (I believe they are called "egg-heads" in the United States) have probably caused a

great deal more harm in this world than the so-called "ignorant."

They were the people who, prior to the last war, were responsible for proposing the disarmament of England, and then were the first to criticize the government for not being prepared for war! These are of the type who, having read the prescribed number of books, have positive answers to all the ills of the world. These are the people who constantly point out all the weaknesses of our democratic state—and they say there are many—and suggest that they could all be solved by writing more cheques or printing more money.

Insofar as Communists are concerned, and the aid and comfort they generally get, these so-called "intellectuals" are, as I have said, to a great extent responsible for the success of the Communists in Europe and Asia.

However, I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who said:

You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time.

The twistings and turnings of the Communists have become so obvious, so blatant and so ridiculous that even great numbers of these so-called "intellectuals" have become disgusted with their machinations and will have nothing further to do with them.

Now, having said this Mr. Speaker, let us forget that some people in St. Andrew were ever misled in this manner, but let us remember that the vast majority of the people in St. Andrew are loyal, patriotic, and fine citizens in the truest sense of the word.

St. Andrew riding is one of, if not *the*, most cosmopolitan ridings in Ontario. We have in our riding Anglo-Saxons, Ukrainians, Jews, Hungarians, Polish, Danish, Dutch, Yugoslavians, Italians, coloured folk, Greeks, Czechoslovakians, French, Chinese, Japanese, Germans, Austrians, and a host of many, many other nationalities. I am almost certain that we have people of

practically every ethnic group in existence today—and with very few exceptions, Mr. Speaker, they are all contributing their share to our culture today—all fine Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate this government upon the fine work it has done in the field of anti-discrimination. Now I realize, as do other hon. members in this House, that one cannot legislate love into the hearts of others, but there is great value in anti-discrimination legislation in that it puts the taint of indecency on prejudice, bias and intolerance. Certainly Mr. Speaker, if we ever intend to keep the H-bomb from destroying us all, we must learn to get along with our neighbours and we must understand that fundamentally the hopes and aspirations of all people are essentially the same, and mutually complementary.

The anti-discrimination laws have created a completely different public opinion in this province.

In the first place they have convinced many people in our minority groups that they no longer need look to the Communist Party—which gives such great lip-service to the cause of freedom and equality—for a champion. They now know that it is not necessary for them to turn to such “rabble-rousers” for an understanding of their problems.

There has never been, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this country, and particularly in the City of Toronto, such a spirit of good social relationships as exists today. A perfect example of this is that, for the first time in the history of Toronto, we have a Jewish mayor.

As further evidence of this spirit may I point out that St. Andrew riding is part of the federal riding of Spadina. Bellwoods riding makes up practically the other half of Spadina riding. In this one area the electors saw fit to elect to the federal House an Anglo-Saxon.

To represent them in the riding of Bellwoods they have chosen my very good friend, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko), who is of Ukrainian origin, and of course, in St. Andrew, they have chosen myself.

This is more remarkable than appears on the surface. I reiterate, these are the same electors who, in a period between June 9 and October 24, in other words within 5 months, saw fit to elect these 3 men, all of different ethnic origins, to represent them. This is something that could not have happened 10 years ago!

The hon. Prime Minister is further to be congratulated upon the fact that he has taken the trouble to see that so many ethnic groups are attracted to his Party.

It is very well Mr. Speaker, to give lip-service to freedom and equality, but it is quite another to practice it. I need only point out such examples of membership in our Party as the present hon. member for Bellwoods, Dr. John Kucherepa, a very fine alderman of the City of Toronto, and Mr. Michael Starr, the Member of Parliament for Oshawa, and many others. The actions of this Party and this government, both in its membership and its legislation, have done more in a few years than all the talking done by my predecessor and his Party, or any other government in the history of this province, yes, in this country. The hon. Prime Minister should be very proud of having pioneered such legislation in this country, and history will record that not only does he expound these principles, but that he has also put them into practice.

On this subject I would like to pay tribute to the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, headed by the Rev. “Dick” Jones, which has done such a wonderful job in the field of human relations. Also such fine people as Mr. Donald Moore of The Negro Citizenship Association, and Rev. William Daniel of Grant African Methodist-Episcopal Church.

In respect of the anti-discrimination legislation, I believe that a further strengthening is in order, and I was pleased the hon. Attorney-General introduced an amendment to The Summary Convictions Act which should be somewhat helpful in this respect.

I had the honour of leading a deputation before the hon. Prime Minister and

the hon. Minister of Labour last week. This deputation consisted of representatives from the Association for Civil Liberties; National Council of YWCA's, Metropolitan YWCA's; Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec; The Anglican Church of Canada; The United Church of Canada; The Canadian Council of Churches; the Canadian Jewish Congress; the Ontario Federation of Labour, TLC and CCL, the Joint Labour Committee for Human Rights; the Negro Citizenship Association; The Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; and The Jewish Labour Committee—who were all concerned about tightening up the anti-discrimination laws, to make them even more effective.

The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Labour gave us a very good hearing and discussed in detail many aspects of this legislation, and I might say that it was brought out at that meeting that the hon. Minister of Labour has done a very fine job in a quiet way in dealing with many cases, without recourse to headlines. I think, rather let us say I hope, that we convinced both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour that some progress could be made by way of setting up an educational programme to further the cause of anti-discrimination—or to put it in a more positive way—the cause of brotherhood.

As a matter of fact, it is my opinion—and I have held it for some time now—that we have reached the stage in our complex society where it has become useless to continue to educate our children only along the time-worn lines of “readin’, writin’ and ’rithmetic.” It is of no use to turn out thousands of graduates each year from our schools who have a smattering of academic training only, but do not understand those forces which will eventually govern their lives.

I suggest to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) that he review the policy of his department as it relates to the curriculum of the schools, and consider instituting a system of education which will lay more stress on the teaching of social relationships, human values, the inter-dependence of all

peoples—a teaching programme which would have the effect of attuning minds to the needs of our times—an awareness of those factors which will eventually either conserve or destroy our way of life or even our lives—in short, the values, privileges and duties of citizenship, combined with an intercultural programme.

For what does it gain us, Mr. Speaker, if we train our children to be brilliant scholars, only to send them out into a complex society, understanding very little about the tenuous foundation of our democratic state, our civilization, how to keep it alive and virile—what factors tend to destroy it—why they must be alert politically so that they may recognize deteriorating influences in domestic and international affairs.

Might I point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, a minor example of this in the matter of the book *Little Black Sambo* which I raised in the House the other day.

There seems to be some suggestion on the part of some people that taking this book off the shelves of the school libraries is a form of censorship and they argue that there was no prejudice involved in the minds of the author or/and those who use the book.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, this misses the point completely. In the first place it is not censorship, because anyone who wishes may buy this book and read it. What we are asking is that this book be not used for the purpose of educating our children. This is something entirely different from censorship.

Surely it is not too much to ask that we consider the feelings of our friend and fellow citizen when he states that this book is offensive to him and particularly so to his children. We should remove it from the classroom so that his children will not suffer any embarrassment because of it. There are thousands upon thousands of books from which to choose, and removing such a book creates no problem at all.

Might I give a perhaps more illustrative example of this, Mr. Speaker? We would not, in our schools, permit any



books which were derogatory in any respect of our established institutions. Yet one is able to pick up from many bookshelves in our book stores, articles which are very critical and contemptuous of our established institutions. As a matter of fact, some of the newspapers in this country quite often make some derogatory remarks concerning these institutions.

Yet I am sure no hon. member of this Legislature would condone such publications as part of the curriculum in our public schools. I strongly recommend to the hon. Minister of Education that he take under very serious consideration the removal, from our school libraries, of any books which might tend to throw hatred, ridicule or contempt upon any of our ethnic groups.

In short, Mr. Speaker, thermo-nuclear warfare will destroy educated and uneducated alike, unless there are enough people in our society who will begin to understand that we must treat all people as brothers and that only by destroying hate and distrust of each other will we ever live in peace.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the curriculum could be so planned as to provide, in addition to the essentials, teaching on the subjects I have outlined for all pupils, for all schools—technical, commercial and secondary.

Such a programme, as a matter of fact, is already in existence in some parts of the United States. Known originally as the Springfield Plan (started in Springfield, Mass.) it is an inter-cultural programme which gives to pupils a knowledge of the contributions by various ethnic groups to the national culture and interdependence of each other.

This may be a radical departure from accepted practice here; but this government has already shown that it does not fear pioneering progressive measures.

Speaking of pioneering progressive measures, I did not intend to make my maiden speech a panegyric of the Frost government, but I must say that if this government, because of the courage

evidenced in bringing in Bill 80—the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act—did nothing else, it will go down in history as the government which made a tremendous contribution to the field of municipal government.

The problem, as it existed in the area of Metropolitan Toronto, was one which had been considered by previous governments, because they all realized the great need for some drastic action due to the rapidly deteriorating situation. I understand that it was considered by the Hepburn government but that government, and all previous governments, lacked the courage to do anything because it was avoided as a political “hot potato.”

It is to the great credit of this government that it “took the bit” in its teeth and took action. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan form of government is working out very well—surprisingly well.

I know I need not go over the history of the Metropolitan area and why something is needed to be done in that connection. Suffice it to say it is doing a wonderful job in many ways—arterial roads, water, sewage disposal, housing, welfare, assessment, parks and civil defence.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, of the part I played as a member of the original Metropolitan Council as the sponsor of a Metropolitan Toronto civil defence scheme, and of being appointed chairman of the Metropolitan Roads Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are going to get amalgamation in the Metropolitan area. I am essentially a decentralist. I believe the best government is a government which is closer to the people, and I think that has been one of the reasons for the success of our municipal system of government in Canada.

On the grounds that the Metropolitan system, under Bill 80, provided essential services and still retained local autonomy, I was quite prepared to support the continuation of such a type of government.

However, while I think that, up to a point, the over-lapping which is a

natural outcome of any additional level of government is quite justified on the grounds of local autonomy, once we put police services under Metro control, which will no doubt be followed by those of fire, health, and planning, there will be but little left for the local municipalities to administer, and, therefore, the outward appearance of local autonomy with only a minimum of administrative powers means that the decentralizing argument no longer will hold good. Visualize large municipalities like Toronto or North York maintaining governments with very little to administer.

My honest opinion is that the framers of Bill 80 had eventual amalgamation in mind when recommending a Metropolitan form of government, and I can realize, after serving on Metro Council since its inception, why the government did not order amalgamation in the first instance. It would have created a chaotic situation. Obviously it was never intended, even by those who favoured amalgamation, that the whole area should be amalgamated at one time. It was argued that amalgamation should be accomplished by progressive steps, that is one or two municipalities at a time.

However, I appreciate now, after the experience I have had, that this would only have compounded the difficulties, because after we had annexed one municipality, the problems which would have been created by rapid, unplanned expansion would have continued in the other 12 municipalities, at a faster pace than we would have been able to clean up the problems in the annexed area.

With hindsight, this becomes more apparent every day, because with Bill 80 we were immediately placed in a position to control essential services in all 13 municipalities, and worked from there in an organized, planned manner, and of course Bill 80, by agreement rather than by forcing amalgamation, has accomplished what needed to be done. For that reason I caution the government against broad changes at this time.

Metropolitan government is working well and we should know within the next 4 or 5 years whether or not Metro should be continued, or whether we should have amalgamation. For that reason, I do not think we should attempt to change the system as it is at the present time to any great extent.

The only real complaint that can be made about Metro at this time is that its members are not elected directly by the people.

I would like to make a suggestion to the government that would accomplish direct representation without appreciably changing the system.

The heads of the municipalities which are represented on Metro, that is the mayors and reeves of the 13 municipalities involved, are all in effect elected directly, because when a voter marks his ballot for the candidates for these offices, he knows that the candidates elected will serve on Metropolitan Council. He is therefore voting for his Metropolitan representative when he marks his ballot.

However, the same does not hold true for the 9 aldermen and two controllers from the City of Toronto, because a voter marks his ballot for one or two aldermen, and one, two, three or four controllers, not knowing, because of the vagaries of the vote, who will head the polls and therefore become a member of Metro.

My suggestion is, in brief, that Bill 80 be amended so that when going to the polls the citizen of Toronto may vote for a Metropolitan alderman and a local alderman; and for Metropolitan and local controllers. Those who are elected as members of Metro Council will serve on Metro as well as on local councils, but those who are elected as local members will serve only on local councils. This is essentially the principle under the county council system.

This would mean, Mr. Speaker, that aside from the chairman who might be selected from outside the council, as he is today, at least 24 of the 25 members would sit on Metro Council because the

voters went to the polls and voted for them as Metropolitan representatives.

I appreciate the fact this does not answer the critics with respect to "representation by population," if one considers municipal boundaries. However, this is not an important factor at this time. If, at some future date during the next 4 or 5 years, it is still felt that the Metro system of government is to become permanent, then will be the time to make radical changes.

The system I suggest will retain contacts with the local municipalities, making certain that those who are on Metro Council are representatives of local municipalities directly. I think this was a far-sighted provision of Bill 80, and so long as we have a Metro system it should be continued.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Metropolitan chairman. If there is any man in public life today who is indispensable in the post he holds, it is Mr. Frederick G. Gardiner, Q.C. He is doing a tremendous job and only those of us who have been closely associated with him in Metro since its inception can know just how indispensable he is.

The success of the Metropolitan system, to a very great extent, is due to his intelligent leadership. There is no doubt in my mind today but that it was a fortuitous circumstance when Mr. Gardiner's professional career permitted him the time to undertake this work just about the same time Metro was formed. His years of municipal experience as a reeve and as warden of the County of York, and as an aggressive and able barrister, qualified him well for that particular job, and I say to the hon. members that it is not only a job for Metropolitan Toronto which Mr. Gardiner is doing, but the ultimate results of his work will redound to the benefit of this whole province.

I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to read the representation by the hon. Prime Minister to the Dominion-Provincial Conference early last fall, in which he pointed out that it cost a great deal to service our prosperity. I

was also very happy that he presented this argument before the Gordon Commission. In a very few words he clarified, and, to my mind, explained better than anyone else has been able to do, the very essence of the problem. The hon. Prime Minister very ably pointed out that what was happening in the Province of Ontario, and I might say in Metropolitan Toronto, was that while the people themselves were enjoying unprecedented prosperity, because of the present division of responsibility between the various levels of government, the area in which the greatest prosperity exists has actually become a financial load on the government of that area, whereas, the government which provides none of the required servicing of that prosperity receives the lion's share of the benefits derived therefrom.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister analyzed the situation very clearly, and quite properly pointed out that prosperity under our existing system is a two-sided one, and that while we are faced with the problem of servicing that prosperity, such as providing the area with hundreds of millions of dollars for schools, water, roads, sewage disposal plants, etc., the profits and wages produced by such a boom are taxed by the Federal Government which draws millions of dollars from this prosperity, and leaves us, as it were, "holding the bag."

May I be permitted to point out a very simple illustration? A subdivider buys land and sells it to a builder at a profit. The builder provides funds for wages for his workmen and to purchase materials. The area, when built up, has perhaps a shopping centre with many stores, and provides a great deal of employment. The corporations involved pay up to 50 per cent. of their profits in income tax. All the workmen, merchants and others concerned—including those who receive wages indirectly as a result of this particular operation—will be paying millions of dollars in income tax to the Federal Government. But it is left to the province and municipality to



provide these people with costly roads to get to and from their places of employment, to provide them with their costly watermains, sewage disposal plants, police, fire and health services, schools for their children, etc. The day of reckoning is at hand, Mr. Speaker, and I say that the Federal Government must do its share to help service the prosperity which bolsters its revenues.

As an example of how indifferent the Federal Government has become in these matters, with your permission, may I quote from an editorial in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, dated December 28, 1955, as follows:

It has been reported that the Dominion Government, through the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, has agreed to sell 36 acres of the Long Branch Rifle Range to Toronto Township as a site for a sewage disposal plant. The price to be paid for the land is \$128,452, which works out at \$3,568 an acre.

Such a price would make the government one of the biggest land profiteers in the country. The parcel being purchased by Toronto Township is part of a tract of more than 300 acres bought by the Dominion in 1912 for \$240 an acre. In the 43 years since, the government has not paid any taxes, nor has it done anything to improve the property.

There, in a nut shell, is a perfect example of how the government, on tax exempt property, made a "killing" because of the services provided by the local municipality, with the assistance of the provincial government, which increased the value of that tax-exempt land, and because of this increased value, the Federal Government sold this land back to the municipality at a tremendous profit. Surely this example points up the absurdity of the whole situation.

An example of the way in which this works is that Metropolitan Toronto is spending this year about \$1 million, one-half of which will be paid by the

Provincial Government, for the widening of the Dixon Road. The highway has to be widened to provide for some 10,000 cars which use that road daily.

I suppose a very conservative figure of the amount of sales tax alone which the Federal Government received from the sale of those cars would be about \$3 million, and yet we are faced with the problem of spending \$1 million to widen this one road alone. Not one cent of this money comes back from the Federal Government.

As far as schools are concerned, Mr. Speaker, no one will deny that our educational system benefits the entire country. When doctors, lawyers, nurses, in fact university students in all courses graduate they travel to other sections of our country and are of great benefit to those areas in which they settle, and yet the Federal Government assumes no responsibility toward helping to finance their training.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a complete re-allocation and re-division of responsibilities and sharing of revenues amongst the 3 levels of government. If there is anything my experience in municipal life has taught me, it is that the system as it is today may have been suitable for the horse-and-buggy days, but today municipalities and provinces provide services at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars; services which provide the Federal Government with hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenues, while the Federal Government gets off scot-free. Obviously this situation requires more than a "horse-and-buggy" approach.

Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed rather odd to me that the Federal Government has failed to recognize its responsibility in dealing with the unemployed employables, particularly in view of the fact that they have admitted, in an indirect way, that it should be responsible for them because of its administration of The Unemployment Insurance Act, and also by the fact that the Federal Government operates employment agencies throughout the

country. Surely this is an admission that unemployment assistance is definitely a problem with which the Federal Government should concern itself. They are also largely concerned with import duties, tariffs, immigration, etc., which are all matters which affect employment; therefore, why should they not be responsible for the care of the unemployed employables?

Many problems of a like nature exist today which did not exist at the time of Confederation, and for many years after, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government must face up to its responsibilities.

I think the public is beginning to understand, as they never did before, the continued callous indifference of the Federal Government by not facing up to those responsibilities. I want to say that the Federal Government should recognize that it can no longer hide behind the theory that these matters are too complicated for the general public—that the public, therefore, does not understand them, does not bother about them, and is going to blame only those governments which are nearer to them—the provincial and municipal governments—for what ails the basic economy of our country today.

The grant system to my mind quite frankly, unconditional or otherwise, is an outmoded, unbusinesslike system, and I think we have finally reached the stage where this has to be considered in a businesslike way. And while I realize that this cannot be done overnight, something should be done by way of discussion with the Federal Government, and with the municipalities, regarding a complete re-allocation of responsibilities and revenues. In other words, we should say to the Federal Government, "These are your responsibilities and these are the sources of your revenue"; say to the Provincial Government, "This is your responsibility and this is the source of your revenue." And the same with regard to the municipalities. So we then can operate our governments in a businesslike manner, know where we are going and know

what to expect, and how to balance—or even create—a budget on a businesslike basis.

The Speech from the Throne announced the intention to institute the two-year term for the municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto. Mr. Speaker, I say from experience, this is such a necessity that I cannot help but strongly urge that the government extend this policy throughout the Province of Ontario. One term is absolutely unsuitable for modern needs. Too much time is spent in preparing for elections, or just getting over one.

Also there is no encouragement, under a one-year term, for a council to support a policy which might be momentarily unpopular, but one which council may know would, in a period of two years, prove to be a wise policy.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 80 is a brilliant example of that very thing. It was a most unpopular Bill at the time it was brought in. The furore created was "out of this world"; it was said it was going to destroy any government which had anything to do with it. However, it was not very long before everyone realized that it was the right thing to do. It has worked out very well, and I think it is a perfect illustration of what I mean, Mr. Speaker, when I say a council has to have time to prove that its policies are wise ones.

I heard some say, incidentally, not too long ago that after all there is permissive legislation applicable to a local municipality. It may do what it likes; if it wants to bring in a two-year term there is nothing to prevent it. That sounds very simple, but actually what is required is that some member of some council has to have the courage to move the motion that the people be asked whether they want a two-year term or not. And someone has to second that motion in council, and then you have to get a majority of council to approve it, before the question goes on the ballot.

In many instances the local councillors are very hesitant about trying anything

like that because their political opponents can immediately make it appear as if all they are interested in is, not good public service, but an extension of their term of office.

I think if this government shows it is better to have a two-year term, from the standpoint of good public service, then we should have it, Mr. Speaker. There may be some criticism but the criticism will last exactly 48 hours and everybody, including the tax-paying citizens, will be very happy about it.

There is no doubt that a two-year term would facilitate a system of biennial assessments and I hope the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Goodfellow) will amend the Act respecting vacancies in those areas where no provision now exists for appointment in case of a vacancy. Obviously if a vacancy occurred, say one-and-a-quarter years after an election, under the biennial compilation of assessment lists, it would hardly be possible to have a by-election, from a voter's list compiled more than a year prior to it.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the unemployment assistance given during 1955. At this time I want to thank the government for the assistance given to the City of Toronto last spring by the unconditional grant of \$500,000 in 1955; this enabled the city to accomplish a great deal.

I am very proud of the part I played in insisting that this money be used exclusively for assistance to the unemployed rather than for the reduction of the tax rate, and I am very proud and happy to say that the plan I sponsored, to use this money for cleaning up our parks by the unemployed, was so successful.

Instead of giving cash relief to these people we saw to it that everyone did a fair day's work and was given a fair day's pay, and I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, it was a complete success. Briefly, the following are some figures in this connection, which the hon. members may find interesting:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Total applications approved .....   | 2,638     |
| Made up of: Heads of families .....   | 790       |
| Single men .....  | 1,818     |
| Single women .....  | 30        |
| Number of work slips issued to persons to report to work—cumulative total ..... | 20,179    |
| Number who received work slips and reported to work—cumulative total .....      | 17,262    |
| Number who received work slips and failed to report—cumulative total .....      | 2,917     |
| Total expenditure as of Oct. 6, 1955  | \$480,323 |
| Rate of pay per day was \$10.   |           |
| Married men with families were given 3 days' work per week.                     |           |
| Single men were given 2 days' work per week.                                    |           |

And it worked out very, very well and I think it was the only way to handle any kind of grant for unemployment relief, that is, in a way where people are proud to do a day's work and know they are not getting a "hand-out."

Mr. Speaker, I would also recommend to the hon. Minister of Labour that some consideration be given to the matter of a review of The Labour Relations Act so that the machinery of processing industrial disputes would work more smoothly and with more speed. I appreciate the fact, as the hon. Minister has pointed out today, that there are a great number of cases handled with a good deal of dispatch but I believe there are, in many instances, situations where some improvement could be made.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Labour will agree there is always room for improvement. As an example of an improvement which could be made, I would point out what happened at a meeting of the Building and Construction Trades and Labour Council which I attended by an invitation which was extended to all hon. members for the Toronto and York ridings.

Incidentally, I might point out to the hon. member for York South, who last week took some issue with the hon. leader of the Opposition because of his non-attendance at a labour gathering, that the only ones who took the trouble



to attend this meeting and discuss the matter with the labour groups were 4 Progressive Conservative hon. members of the House.

At this meeting it was pointed out by these building trades people, who want to be excluded from the Act, that on occasion a building would be completed before the processing of the machinery of the Act was completed. This meant, in their opinion, that the Act was of no help to them at all. I promised I would bring this to the attention of the government and I am doing so.

I have drawn this to the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour and I am sure he will review the situation with a view to alleviating this particular problem.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, which is of great concern to the people of my riding, as I suppose it is to the people of all ridings, and that is the matter of pensions for our senior citizens. This is another situation which should be handled in a business-like manner. The only solution to this problem is that old-age pensions should be tied to the cost-of-living index. A basic figure should be set, and then, if the cost of living goes up, the pension should be increased and if it goes down, perhaps it should be decreased. In discussions with the Federal Government this possibility should be explored.

Every time a corporation increases its prices, every time labour organizations get an increase in wages, this group—the pension group—is the only group which is helpless to adjust itself to the rising costs.

This very important group of our citizens, the aged, are constantly being squeezed between the fixed income they have, and the increased cost of living, and of all the groups in our midst, this group is the most helpless, and should receive the most attention.

Of all the matters of which I have spoken, most important to my mind is the matter of an intensive programme of the teaching of "The Brotherhood of Man." Tax, traffic, and health problems, revenues, etc., are all very important—

but unless we do something about living peacefully with our neighbours all the other problems will be left for the radioactive germs to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. members of this House for listening so patiently to me today. I can assure them that this is probably the longest speech I will ever make in this House, and they need not fear that I intend to equal the record for speeches established by my predecessor. I intend to speak only when I have something constructive to say, and should I ever do otherwise, I am sure the hon. members of this House will draw that fact to my attention.

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise again in this House and to congratulate you on receiving the very high honour of being elevated to the Speaker's chair and I am also very happy to say that I am sure you will conduct the affairs of this House very well. May I also add that your wife is proving to be a very fine hostess, behind the scenes.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity on being elevated to a very important position, and I am sure his department is in good and capable hands. I cannot say that I whole-heartedly agree with the buttons which are being handed out by his department but I am really no authority, and I would leave this to its discretion for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reminisce to some extent on what hydro, in my opinion, has done for this province, and for the great economy and prosperity of the past, and will undoubtedly do in the future for the people of this province.

I sat in this House from 1945 to 1948 when pressure was really put on this department. We had power shortages in every direction. In fact I believe at the beginning of 1945 we had only approximately 1,800,000 hp. in the entire province. The farmers were clamouring loud and long for power for labour-saving as there was a distinct shortage

of labour, not only in the farming country but all through the province, and there was a distinct shortage of all types of labour saving appliances. Hydro has been responsible for the great demand for electrical appliances needed in order to save labour.

Hydro has helped us also to keep up-to-date with radio and television. I understand that at the start of 1945 there were practically no television sets in the province, and today it is estimated there are over a million. This one type of appliance alone takes practically all the power we had available in 1945. That, plus the several hundred designs of other electrical appliances, have certainly helped to make life a great deal easier for our people in this province.

Hydro also brought several hundred new industries to the province and has been responsible for creating additions to several hundred additional industries. In fact, the increase in population since the war has been due directly to our great hydro-electrical development. Hydro has brought several new industries for our people and will bring many more in the future.

All this time, that is, from 1946 on, our Socialist friends of the CCF Party were crying "Blue Ruin". In fact, we had a little example of this on Thursday afternoon in this House, when the CCF leader said that conditions had reached the peak and were now starting to taper off. That is the same story I have been hearing from them for the last 25 years. Yet Canada and Ontario have marched on, and with the future planning I have seen, and am seeing now of hydro, and the general conditions of our people, I have every confidence for the future.

I have read a manuscript presented by Dr. Richard L. Hearn to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Progress. I am sure we all felt, as we still do, that we had a splendid leader of hydro in the person of the late Robert Saunders. There is no doubt he laid the groundwork for a great deal of the past, present and future develop-

ments; but I can see that the present engineers and our present executive leader, Richard L. Hearn, have the matter well in hand for the future of this province.

As we all know, the development of water power has almost reached its peak. The hydro several years ago commenced research into developing atomic power and they hope to have 500,000 additional horsepower before 1965, and almost 4 million by 1975. The future developments in atomic energy are going to add to the development of this province, in a very important way, in the next 10 to 15 years.

The experts prophesy, however, that even with all this extra power several more steam plants may be required before 1965. The planning and engineering work is going on behind the scenes right now. Most of this work has been in filling in the development of hydro power and the planning for the future of this department for the people of the province.

This, in my opinion, has been the backbone of the developments of this province to a very large extent since the Second Great War, and I hope that the present management and engineering staff will meet with every success in the future. They will help to keep the wheels of industry moving and ensure the future prosperity of our citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to The Department of Mines in charge of which we have the very efficient Minister (Mr. Kelly), a very modest man who is not in the habit of "blowing his own horn."

Under his leadership, The Department of Mines has marched ahead with great progress, bringing tremendous wealth and prosperity to this province. The iron mines at Steep Rock—and this is only one of several hundred developments—means much to the development of this great province. The natural gas that will be coming in from the West, to some extent I believe will come under The Department of Mines, and I am sure we all hope this development will go ahead as rapidly as possible, to

bring this great natural resource to the homes of the people of Ontario.

The more competition we have, in my opinion, the better, and right now the competition is only between coal and fuel oil for the heating of our homes. I believe that neither one of these industries is suffering very much, so I am sure we can all look forward to welcoming gas as a competitor in this field which will probably bring our coal and oil industry in line and, we hope, produce cheaper fuel.

Another great activity of The Department of Mines is the development of a plan to secure water from underground. As some of the hon. members probably know, there is a terrific shortage of water today in some parts of this province. As I have already mentioned, we have taken hydro down all the side roads and by-roads to our farmers, and taken telephone wires down those same side roads and by-roads before hydro.

With all our great supplies of fresh water from our 5 great lakes, which are only a comparatively few miles away from any farming area or town site in this province—probably not over 200 miles at the most—I believe there should never be a shortage of fresh water anywhere in this province. As I have already mentioned we have the iron ore, we have the great steel mills to smelt the ore and turn it into sheet metals, we have the pipe mills to manufacture it into pipe, we have the contractors and the machinery to lay pipe and the great labour force behind the scenes to do the work, so why should there be any shortages of water anywhere in our province, when we have our own resources and our own people to develop the water system of this province?

We have in Hamilton a very fine bay. When I came to Hamilton in 1922, there were several beautiful bathing beaches on this bay, in fact there was one at the foot of Bay Street, operated by the City of Hamilton, and closed by the Board of Health possibly 20 years ago, but bathing continued at Burlington Beach and LaSalle Park, but even this has been stopped for several years. In

fact, someone was seen putting his feet into Hamilton Bay last year on the north side, and there was a great cry about the "health menace to the public" by bathing in the waters of this bay.

Now I am told that prior to 1918, this bay was considered a "fisherman's paradise." Today it is absolutely impossible to even bathe in it, in any way, shape or form, and I believe there are other waters in this province just as bad.

I happen to have the pleasure of serving on the Select Committee on Smoke Control and Air Pollution which, in my opinion, is doing a splendid job. But water pollution is still uncontrolled and can become a very great health menace. I believe a start should be made immediately to clean up the waters which are polluted, not only in Hamilton Bay, but everywhere in the province. The public funds of this province could well be used to bring about conditions which would be really clean and sanitary. I hope this is one of the things which will be given very careful study by this government in the days ahead, and as quickly as possible, so as to provide an abundance of clean water everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again turn to one of our departments which, in my opinion, has done a terrific job since 1943, and I must say before going too far that the former Prime Minister, Col. George Drew, had a great deal to do with the development of hydro, mines, lands and forests and all the other departments of this government. Our own Prime Minister has done a wonderful job in this direction for the last 8 years. The Department of Lands and Forests has done and is doing a magnificent job in developing our natural resources.

All we have to do is to look at the 3 new towns on Lake Superior—Marathon, Terrace Bay and Red Rock. These great towns are contributing great wealth to the treasury of our province, and that of the Dominion, and to the people who work these resources, directly and indirectly.



There is one very important matter in connection with the department, with which I have been very pleased. I have had the pleasure of talking to several Junior Rangers who had attended the summer school conducted by this department. There will never be any greater boosters for the wild life and the development of our lands and forests than the boys who have gone through this summer school. In fact it may be that some of these boys have spent the happiest time they have ever spent in their lives at this school. I believe something along the same line could be developed by the Department of Mines, as I believe the money spent would probably provide one of the greatest educational sources possible.

The boys marvel at the efficient fire-fighting forces we have under the direction of The Department of Lands and Forests, the great summer-resort development, providing playgrounds for our people and the touring public of the world, at the great wild-life development—fish, game, birds, and so on. I hope the department will continue to develop these Junior Ranger activities to the very limit.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned only 3 of the great departments of this province. Every department—Education, Health, Welfare, Planning and Development, Department of the Attorney-General, Treasury Department and so on—these are all doing a fine job for the people of this province.

I have not time right now to delve into them too deeply, but I do want to mention one thing further. I happened, Mr. Speaker, to have had the honour of being elected to the Hamilton City Council from the years of 1936 to 1945. Probably 10 of the happiest years of my life were spent in helping to develop the great City of Hamilton. Mind you, Hamilton is still marching right along. Our industrial development has been terrific and is continuing; our municipal departments and our city government are doing everything possible to keep in step with the progress of Ontario. At times terrific problems have to be

faced, but things are going along as well as can be expected under the circumstances.

I would like to mention one thing in particular. In the years 1936, through 1945, we had approximately 155,000 people in Hamilton, plus an additional 30,000 in the County of Wentworth. Our jail in Hamilton is a county jail. We had terrific over-crowding in our jail during that period, and several times it was considered increasing the size of the jail, or building a new jail farm. But to my surprise and amazement today, with an additional 100,000 people in the County of Wentworth, the problem has solved itself. We have not increased the capacity of the jail but the jail population has decreased and I have not heard of serious over-crowding in the last 5 or 6 years. That proves to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Reform Institutions and its hon. Minister are doing a splendid job for this province, that our hon. Attorney-General's department and Provincial Police are also doing a splendid job, and that the Hamilton City Police, plus our magistrates and police commissioners also deserve considerable praise. We do have this problem of water and air pollution and it must and will be cleaned up, so you can see that Hamilton is truly marching on to be a better and happier place in which to raise our children and to live in ourselves, and to plan and develop for the future a wealthier Canada.

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my word of congratulation to you, on your appointment to your office at this session. Those of us who have had the privilege of having known you over a period of years will readily realize the fact that you will fill the office most admirably, and to the satisfaction of all hon. members of this House. May I be permitted to offer to you and Mrs. Downer our sincere congratulations.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a few matters which I consider of great importance to the hon.

members of this House, and in connection with various departments of government.

To begin with, I would like to say something in connection with the matter of trade unions. Just today at noon, I had a situation brought into my office which I think is of some moment to the hon. members of this House, and indeed to the members of trade unionism generally. The story very briefly is as follows:

A short while ago, in the City of Toronto, a corporation undertook to erect an apartment house, and in so doing apparently did not contemplate employing union labour. But a contracting firm was engaged to do certain excavation work, and they entered into a contract with the proposed owners of the apartment house structure to do certain work at a certain price. But after having worked for approximately 3 weeks, one day the excavating contracting firm received an advice from one of the officers of the union, telling him that he had to stop work. The way they informed the manager of the firm was by giving him a letter saying he must observe certain union regulations, and the operators of the steam shovel were told if they continued to work, they would be subject to a substantial *per diem* fine.

The net result was the contracting firm was not able to complete its contract, litigation followed, and the would-be owner of the apartment house sued the excavating contractor for damages. The action ultimately resolved itself into a mechanics' lien action which was brought by the contracting firm against the would-be owners, and was awarded a certain sum of money for the work they had done, but against that, the contracting firm had a judgment rendered against it for a very substantial amount of damages.

May I draw the attention of the House to this fact, that in this particular case, the excavating contracting firm was obliged to relinquish the carrying out of its contract, as a result of a directive from certain officials of the trade union, which ultimately resulted

in a substantial judgment being rendered against the firm, from the same cause.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if trade unions generally are to operate on such a basis, or if that is even an inkling on the part of trade unions that such action will be the trend, then I think it is high time trade unions be compelled to incorporate and assume responsibility for the actions of the union itself, and of its members.

At the present time, corporate bodies are responsible in damages on union contracts, but that principle does not always work on the other side, that is, on the side of labour, insofar as trade unions are concerned. It is not always possible for a corporation, which may have a trade union contract, to sue the union because the union is an unincorporated body, and at the very most, direct action might be taken against certain individuals, who might or might not be substantial in their own respective status, as regards this world's goods.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, to my mind that represents a situation of very practical importance in regard to employer-employee relations, which I felt constrained to bring to the attention of this House at this time.

I sincerely hope and trust that such action will not become the usual course of conduct on the part of trade unions, which might ultimately become the trend on the part of trade unions generally.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to say just a word in regard to one phase of the operation of The Department of Education. As all hon. members know, we have in this province today, attending our elementary and secondary schools, approximately one million students and we also employ something in excess of 30,000 teachers, and, accordingly, we have to provide schools and buildings to accommodate those who are teaching, and those who are to be taught.

In many of our up-and-coming municipalities, it has become, of necessity, the custom to erect new schools which cost considerable sums of money. At the same time, we do have in some of

the municipalities in southern Ontario—particularly the older municipalities, those which were populated earlier than others—schools which have fulfilled their purpose for a number of years, until the time has come when some of these older buildings have reached the stage where they require funds to be spent upon them for renovations. Then perhaps it is found there is not available to those school boards, responsible for making such renovations, a grant for renovating the premises.

On the other hand, however, if the school board was to decide to demolish the old school building and erect a new one, then, of course, a grant from The Department of Education is made available. That, to my mind, just does not add up economically.

My thinking is this, that as ordinary business people, if you or I had a home and we reached the stage where it might cost, let us say, \$1,000 to renovate the home, I believe we would spend the \$1,000 in renovating the property, rather than demolish the whole building, and starting to build a completely new house. I feel that precisely the same situation is applicable to schools which require renovation or repairs, and this should be done, rather than to erect new schools throughout.

By and large, The Department of Education, as I have said in previous years, has fulfilled a magnificent purpose, in supplying the needs, educational-wise, of the youth of this province. Particularly in the case of "new Canadians," many facilities have been made available to them in order that they may acquaint themselves with the English language and the customs we follow here, whereby they may the more readily be made a part of us, and not always be "new Canadians" but become "Canadians," the same as you and I.

I would like to say a word now in connection with The Department of Agriculture. There have been some comments made by some hon. members relative to various pieces of marketing legislation and other matters pertaining to The Department of Agriculture. The only observation I wish to make is to

deal with the matter of the sale of butter, which the hon. member for Bruce mentioned yesterday, whereby through the initiative of the Federal Government, several million pounds of butter were made available to the markets of Europe—I believe it was—at 37 cents a pound, whereas the floor price of butter in Canada, supported on the basis set forth by the Federal Government, is 58 cents a pound, a difference of 20 cents a pound. Every taxpayer in this country is contributing or has contributed to that subsidy, not to some individual, nor to some bodies in Canada, but to a group of people outside of Canada.

I do not wish to say—and I do not say—that we should not help our fellow men in Europe. I think we should. But if we are going to pass our butter, or any other agricultural commodity from this country to some other country at a reduction in price with a subsidy which is necessarily going to have to be borne by the people of this country, I think the people of this country should at least be consulted about it.

But, up until now, what we find is this, that we learn it is an accomplished fact after it has been accomplished, and not only that, but we read in the Press where there is a likelihood of a similar situation being duplicated in the future.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this country we have a number of people who might be willing, with the assistance rendered at federal level, to pass the butter around to our various public institutions at a reduced price, and even to individuals who find themselves in needy circumstances, also at a reduced price. The people who come to Canada as "new Canadians" we might be prepared to help, but personally I cannot see any justification, economically or any other way, whereby anything can be gained in that regard.

It has been suggested that by passing the butter to another country we in Canada here are creating a market for the dairy industry. That may be true, but I want to remind the hon. members of this House of this fact, the production of butter is one phase of our



agricultural industry in this country, but what about our wheat which also has a floor price and where we also have a stock pile?

The same thing holds true in regard to the United States. We in Canada and the United States have been blessed with great productivity, but I think in the administration or the dispersal of these goods which God has given us in these two favoured countries, we should endeavour to pass it around with a view to taking care basically of the economic requirements in our own country rather than to pass it out through a broker into a foreign country where some one else may reap a profit at the expense of the citizens in Canada and Ontario.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, Would the hon. member suggest industry do the same thing with their surpluses?

MR. BRANDON: Industry in respect of their surpluses have, by and large, endeavoured to be co-operative.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. member take a portion of it and sell it at one-third off? It is essentially the same principle.

MR. BRANDON: No, it is not. It is entirely different. I would be glad to discuss that with the hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: I hope the hon. members from the farms are listening to this, because it is an interesting statement.

MR. BRANDON: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this very principle which I have enunciated is one of great moment to the people of this province and to the people of every province in Canada, bar none.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, particularly the farmers.

MR. BRANDON: Now then, what happens to the farmer today? We go to the butcher shop and buy beef for possibly 49 or 59 cents a pound, as compared with perhaps 69 cents a

pound which we paid a year ago, those of us who live in the urban centres save 20 cents a pound.

We buy our potatoes and vegetables at a price less than we paid a year ago. The cost of farm produce today is going down. The farmer fills a basic industrial need in this country, if it were not for the farmers no industry would be able to progress, nor any profession; each of us here is dependent entirely upon the farmers and their success, for the eventual success of whatever industry in which we are interested, or in whatever profession we are engaged.

I say to you the farmer is an individual who has of necessity to be looked after, but we do find, as a matter of fact, that his revenue from farm products is decreasing. The farmer in due course wants to buy some farm implements, and he finds not that he can buy a tractor cheaper today than he could a year ago or that he can buy a plough cheaper today than he could a year ago, but, on the contrary, he finds he has to pay a considerable amount more. The reason for this is that in our industries—and particularly in those industries which manufacture farm implements—the cost of the articles he wants to buy have been bolstered through increases in costs of material and labour. You have this situation where the farmer in supplying his produce on the world's markets is receiving less money, but if he wants to go out and improve his methods of production he has to pay more for the implements in order that he may increase—or even maintain—the stability of the production which he has achieved over the years.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member want to reduce his income some more?

MR. BRANDON: The fact of the matter is that somewhere along the line there has to be a stability of cost and of revenue as far as our agricultural industry is concerned. None of us want to see the farmers get into the position in which they were in the early thirties,

when a bag of potatoes could be bought for 75 cents and as a result of the small amount of revenue coming to the farmers they were unable to employ help. Today we have agricultural help in terms of agricultural implements rather than by farm labour in the main, but if you cannot employ labour, you cannot buy the implements, and if the farmers cannot carry on successfully, the only thing they can do is to turn to some other field of endeavour.

I am well cognizant of the fact that a great number of "new Canadians" who have come to this country are engaged directly in the agricultural industry. I was very pleased to note a year ago when I, with some of the hon. members of this Legislature, had the opportunity of visiting a little town called Emo in northwestern Ontario, to learn that a large group of Dutch settlers had located in that area and had taken over a number of so-called "abandoned farms," farms which those who had been operating them were no longer able to operate at a profit.

These Dutch settlers had come in and taken over these farms and had set up a co-operative of their own, and were going to ship milk to the Lakehead, and do a great number of other things by way of development agriculturally.

What this Province of Ontario needs—indeed what Canada needs—is enough people with foresight, with ambition, and with the desire to see that the farmers today are given a square deal, not only in regard to the prices of some commodities, but the things which I have mentioned, right across the board. If industrial labour expects to have its standard of living raised—and I find no fault with that—the farmer has every bit as much right to expect to have his standard of living raised proportionately. That is the only way in which we can hope to bring about a stability of economy across the board of people engaged in various industries.

Now, if I might say a word or two in regard to some municipal matters. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) mentioned something con-

cerning municipal affairs this afternoon when dealing with Metropolitan problems. I want to deal more or less on a general basis with regard to some of those matters and make some suggestions, if I may, relative thereto. The first thing which occurs to me is the matter of taxes; when you talk about a municipality you talk about individuals and taxes.

A person goes into a municipality and wants to buy a house, and one of the first questions he wants to have answered is, "What are the taxes on the house?" If the taxes are too high he may not be interested. However, if it is a moderate amount and he considers it reasonable, he may be interested in the purchase of the property.

As we all know, taxes and the mill rate emanate from the assessments.

Dealing first of all with assessments in the Metropolitan area, I might say that prior to 1953, when Metropolitan Toronto came into being, we had as many bases of assessment in the 13 municipalities as there were municipalities. Each municipality was assessing on its own basis. Today, of necessity, that condition has changed.

Some of the hon. members may wonder why it was that assessments were varied to the extent which I have indicated. The reason is very simple. Some of the municipalities in the Metropolitan Area are still known as "townships," which is the greatest and broadest municipality there is, but it is also the type of municipality which receives the greatest amount of practical financial assistance by way of government grants. There are many municipalities qualified for classification as a city, or a town or a village but who choose to remain in the broader category, rather than be placed in one of the other categories such as I have mentioned.

As I say, in Metropolitan Toronto that is changed. Today we do have a uniform assessment in the suburban municipalities which was premised during this past year upon a basis similar to that adopted in the City of Toronto

proper. The assessment in the City of Toronto proper was adopted in 1948, but since that time there has not been a general revision of assessment on a general basis. There has, of course, been a revision of assessment in Toronto since that time, but today, to all intents and purposes, an assessment in the City of Toronto and in the suburban municipalities is supposed to be on a par.

Assessments present very great problems in having them finalized through a local assessor. Those of us who have been on municipal councils are all very familiar with this problem. A council may have suggested to an assessor that he should assess such-and-such a property on such-and-such a basis. If such be the case, that assessment was regarded as being on a term basis, on account of its being associated with the general collection of taxes. There is no reason why we should not devote a considerable amount of time to this matter of assessment.

Therefore, what I want to say in regard to assessment is this: ultimately it is beneficial and in the interest of all municipalities and all people resident in municipalities across the province that there should be a uniformity of assessment in any given area or region, and to that end the Metropolitan assessment has already been made uniform.

I realize there are some obstacles in the suggestion I am about to make, but ultimately I can foresee a uniform assessment being made right across this province, with the same basis, the same method of assessment to be applied in each municipality.

As some of you may say, "Outside of Metropolitan Toronto, what is the necessity for that?" The reasons are many, but just to give you one, there is very direct application in the following: we are all familiar with the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and we all realize that when that development is completed, there will be a greater expansion and a greater extension than we even contemplate in the municipalities along the shores of the Great Lakes.

To me, and possibly to a great number of others, it is not a foolish thought to envisage the fact that industrial Ontario may extend from many miles to the east of Toronto to many miles to the west, including a number of these municipalities which presently are located on the shores of Lake Ontario.

It may very well be there will be problems of a similar nature to those faced by the 13 municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto, when you take in 25 or 30 municipalities. If you have a differential in the assessment basis, before you can assess or levy a tax equitably on all municipalities in a given area, the first thing you must do is equalize the assessment. By setting up a uniform basis of assessment and extending it across the province, I suggest to you it will be of great moment and of great benefit to the municipalities at large.

I have one other point to make in regard to assessment: we all know of the method whereby assessments have been made in past years, especially in some of the rural municipalities where an assessor was not paid a salary, but an honorarium. That honorarium ranged anywhere from \$25 to \$100, and for that amount the municipal council could not expect too much. Therefore the assessor gave service proportionate to the monetary return he received.

In years gone by it would not be an uncommon thing to find an assessor who might be a farmer in a community writing up the assessment roll for 1931, and having the 1930 assessment roll beside him, copying out verbatim the 1930 assessment roll onto the 1931 roll, which would be the assessment for that year.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, would it just be a farmer who would do it that way?

MR. BRANDON: I am not suggesting farmers alone. In any municipality it might occur.

MR. MacDONALD: A Freudian error, Mr. Speaker.



MR. BRANDON: Mr. Speaker, due to the largely populated urban centres it is not always convenient to have an assessor, or an assessment staff, carry out a revision of the assessment every 12 months. A few years ago—back in 1948, to be exact—when the City of Toronto was re-assessed, the Assessment Commissioner of Toronto at that time made the suggestion that as far as he was concerned it was absolutely impossible to re-assess Toronto in the course of 12 months.

It was suggested that Toronto itself be divided into 3 areas, and that every year the assessment of one-third of Toronto might be revised and brought up-to-date. In order to do that something along that line might be made practical, and I would think it would not be out of line if, instead of having assessments made every 12 months, they be made every second year.

Because, under section 51, I think it is now, of The Assessment Act, in every municipality where there is an additional building or increase in assessment, the municipality may benefit from that assessment by way of a supplementary assessment or supplementary tax bill. So as I say, the municipality itself would not be harmed in any shape, manner or form.

Mr. Speaker, I want to delve into two or three other matters at some length. Before doing that may I point out that it will take me much beyond 6 o'clock in order to accomplish that, and what I suggest is that at this stage I may be permitted to adjourn the debate, and I so move.

Motion agreed to.

HON. DANA PORTER: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I wish to announce that tomorrow we shall proceed with certain second readings as appear today as Orders No. 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23, dealing with Bills No. 81, 82, 83, 84 and 85, "The Seed Potatoes Act", "The Ontario Food Terminal Act", "The Farm Products Marketing Act", "The Junior Farmers Establishment Act, 1952", and "The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956." Also, we shall proceed with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 of the clock p.m.

## FIRST ERRATA

(February 15, 1956)

| <i>Page</i> | <i>Column</i> | <i>Line</i> | <i>Corrections</i>                           |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 157         | 1             | 37          | Change "HON. MR. FROST" to "HON. MR. FOOTE". |
| 157         | 1             | 45          | Change "HON. MR. FROST" to "HON. MR. FOOTE". |
| 157         | 2             | 3           | Change "HON. MR. FROST" to "HON. MR. FOOTE". |



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, February 15, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Wednesday, February 15, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| First report Standing Committee on Education, Mr. Davies .....                  | 245 |
| Presentation of report, Mr. Dunbar .....  | 245 |
| Seed Potatoes Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, second reading .....              | 245 |
| Ontario Food Terminal Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, second reading .....      | 246 |
| Farm Products Marketing Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, second reading .....    | 247 |
| Junior Farmer Establishment Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, second reading .... | 256 |
| Co-operative Loans Act, 1956, Bill intituled, Mr. Thomas, second reading .....  | 259 |
| Beach Protection Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, second reading .....            | 263 |
| Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Brandon .....           | 264 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Myers, agreed to .....                            | 275 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                                   | 275 |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. M. C. Davies from the Standing Committee on Education presented the committee's first report as follows and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The 1954 statement of the returns under section 235 and section 241 of The Municipal Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome to this House this afternoon 57 NATO air crew students, who are stationed at London, in Western Ontario. These students come from the Turkish Air Force, the Royal Air Force, the French Air Force, the Royal Norwegian Air Force, the Italian Air Force, the Royal Danish Air Force, The Royal Netherlands Air Force, the Belgian Air Force and our own Canadian Air Force. We welcome them this afternoon and we hope they will enjoy the proceedings.

### THE SEED POTATOES ACT

Hon. F. S. Thomas moves second reading of Bill No. 81, "An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister should make some statement with respect to this Act. Wherein does the amendment differ from the parent Act? What is he seeking to do by this Act?

HON. MR. THOMAS: This Act was passed in 1950 and those members of this House may have forgotten at that time the procedure and the purpose of the Act. Also, new hon. members may not be familiar with the Act.

Therefore, I wish to state that the original Seed Potatoes Act was passed in 1950. It comes under the category of enabling legislation and allows any

municipality to pass a by-law establishing all or part of the municipality as a seed potato area.

Potatoes are subject to injury from any insects and diseases, as the hon. members know. It is easier to combat these attacks where all growers plant certified or foundation seed, as provided by the Act. The Lafontaine area in Tiny Township of North Simcoe is established as such an area.

The Seed Potatoes Act, 1950, provides for:

1. Establishing well-defined areas by by-law. Eighty per cent. of the growers in the area must vote in favour before the council can pass the by-law.

2. All seed used must be of foundation or certified grade.

3. All potatoes moving out of the area must be in new bags.

4. All storages, bags and equipment in the area must be disinfected at least once a year.

5. No potatoes below grade "certified" can move into the area without a permit.

6. The township council must appoint an inspector and under certain conditions his wages and expenses may be paid by the Minister, to an extent of not more than 50 per cent.

7. The penalties for contravention of this Act are \$25 to \$200.

The Lafontaine area involves about 90 growers. After 5 years of operation certain minor revisions have been found necessary.

Section 1, clause (b), the words "Crops, Seeds and Weeds Branch" have been changed to "Field Crops Branch", to conform with the present name of the branch involved.

Section 1, clause (c), the definition of "grower" has been changed from "a person who grows more than one acre of potatoes" to "a person who grows potatoes". The original definition proved to be too broad in its scope and was subject to some misuse.

A new subsection has been added under section 15 to provide, where necessary, for exemptions by regulation. This subsection reads as follows: "de-

fining classes of persons and exempting such classes from the Act and the regulations." The original intent of the Act was to exempt only small lot holders such as the residents of the hamlet of Lafontaine, and there was no intention of exempting an owner of a farm where he and members of his family may *each* be growing one acre of potatoes and therefore consider themselves to be outside the scope of the Act.

It is neither expensive nor difficult even for the small lot owner to comply with the Act by planting certified rather than table stock seed.

In most areas probably no exemptions will be required but should unforeseen circumstances arise, then persons requiring exemption can be classified and exemptions provided in the regulations as provided for in the revision to section 15.

Since these areas are established by a vote of the potato growers within the area, the original intent is not changed and therefore a new vote is not necessary.

That, I think, answers the question which the hon. leader of the Opposition asked of me.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves second reading of Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act."

He said: The amendments to The Ontario Food Terminal Act are as follows:

1. Section 7 of The Ontario Food Terminal Act sets out the manner in which all moneys received by the Ontario Food Terminal Board shall be used; i.e., (1) payment of operating expenses, (2) payment of interest and (3) repayment of principal moneys borrowed. Surplus funds above these 3 requirements are to be used to reduce the cost of operation including the fees,

rents or other charges made by the board.

The cost of the Food Terminal has been financed by a 30-year debenture issue guaranteed as to principal and interest by the province. The new section authorizes the Treasurer of Ontario to receive semi-annual repayments of principal from the board in amounts necessary to retire the debentures guaranteed by the province.

2. Section 15 of the Act provides penalties for violations by any person of the Act or the regulations or any rules made under the Act. The present penalties on summary conviction are not less than \$25 or not more than \$200, or to imprisonment for a term of not more than 30 days or both for any second or subsequent offences. The nature of the great majority of the offences at the terminal relate to motor vehicle traffic and are usually for speeding or illegal parking. Other less numerous offences relate to The Liquor Control Act and the Criminal Code.

The amendment proposes to delete the minimum fine and/or imprisonment sentence for second or subsequent offences so that the court will be enabled to impose fines and sentences for speeding and illegal parking in line with the same fines and sentences provided for in The Highway Traffic Act.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the amount of the total debenture that was guaranteed by the province.

HON. MR. THOMAS: In a further speech, I will give the full details of The Ontario Food Terminal Act, and will answer such questions.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves second reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act."

He said: The amendment of The Farm Products Marketing Act is as follows:

During the Federal-Provincial Conference held at Ottawa October 3 and 4, 1955, the Government of Ontario requested the Government of Canada to present to Parliament a Bill specifically authorizing the Governor-in-Council to grant to any producer marketing board or agency, authorized under the laws of the province, power to impose an indirect tax by way of licence fee, levy or charge on the persons engaged in the production or marketing of the agricultural product and to provide for the equalization of returns received from the sale of agricultural products.

Representatives of the Government of Canada advised the province that before presenting such a Bill the provincial marketing legislation including the schemes, regulations and orders should be submitted to the courts to determine their validity. The representatives of the Government of Canada further advised that, if a request was made to refer the question of the validity of any such legislation, the Government of Canada would refer the question to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Government of Ontario through the Minister of Agriculture made such a request which the Government of Canada has now approved and the case will begin on April 24 next.

All the other provincial Marketing Acts in Canada, except The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act, are specific on the point that their scope is limited to the marketing of regulated products within the province. For this reason, question number one in reference to the Supreme Court hearing provides in the opening words: "Assuming that the said Act applies only in the case of inter-provincial transactions."

The purpose and intent of the amendment to our Farm Products Marketing Act then is only to make it abundantly clear that the purview of the Act is limited to the Province of Ontario, so that this point may not arise during the Supreme Court hearing.



MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Before final disposition is made of this amendment, it affords an opportunity for discussing with the hon. Minister the submission made to the Supreme Court.

We have never had in this House anything in the nature of the Provincial Government's submission to the Supreme Court. I can see no reason why the House should not be informed as to the nature of this submission, in order that the hon. members of the Legislature may have an opportunity of analyzing the type of submission which has been—or is to be—placed before the Supreme Court.

The other day, in discussing the question of the Milk Control Board, it was intimated—and I believe it to be a fact—that the government is also referring certain aspects of The Milk Control Act for a decision by the Supreme Court. There are one or two points, Mr. Speaker, which have occurred to me in respect to these submissions on the part of the Provincial Government.

For instance, the question of The Milk Control Act. This matter was brought to the forefront by a court's decision which was rendered in a Brampton case. The judge ruled in that case that The Milk Control Board was not competent to issue the orders and do the things it had been purporting to do through the years. The Milk Control Board had been exercising its authority for many years. It had been exercising the authority of prohibition, which it actually never had under The Milk Control Act, but it had not been questioned in the court until this decision at Brampton.

I am suggesting to the hon. Prime Minister, it is clear to one who reads the judgment in the Brampton case that The Milk Control Board overstepped its authority.

HON. MR. FROST: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: I think if you read the decision, you will find I am right, because the decision was based on the fact.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, it was by the Supreme Court of Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, the decision was based on the fact that the Milk Control Board was exercising a prohibition, when, by Statute, they did not possess the authority.

What I am suggesting to the House is: that does not constitute any reason whatever for referring The Milk Control Act to the Supreme Court of Canada. This Legislature, in the course of a day or two, can enact an amendment to The Milk Control Act which will give it the authority it was supposed to have had during the years, but which it actually did not possess.

In referring this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada, I am suggesting the government is by-passing the Legislature, which I believe is competent to enact an amendment to The Milk Control Act, which would put the board in a position of having the authority which it has been exercising all these years.

The hon. Prime Minister can speak when I am through, but I want to speak just for a moment, while I am on my feet, on the general submission of the marketing legislation to the Supreme Court.

The hon. members are aware, I am sure, that there have been in provincial jurisdictions two attacks, of which there are records, on marketing legislation.

One of them was in British Columbia in 1938. I have the name of the case here, but it is not necessary to mention it. The grounds for proceeding against the authority of the board were stated to be, in the first place, that it was disputed that the board was operating solely within provincial boundaries. That was one of the points. Another was that the board did not have the power, because of its provincial character, to levy and collect assessments from farm products for marketing purposes.

The judicial committee of the highest court in the province at that time ruled that in its judgment, there was no doubt that the Provincial Parliament of

British Columbia had ample authority to pass this legislation, and that it was fully competent, under provincial law, to carry out the provisions of the Act.

As I say, that Act was challenged in 1938, on what I believe to be precisely the same grounds as are being referred to the Supreme Court of Canada for interpretation and decision at the present time.

Another attack occurred in 1952, by the Province of Prince Edward Island and, quoting from the judgment in the British Columbia case, the marketing legislation of Prince Edward Island was held to be *intra vires* of the Provincial Government of that province.

I am suggesting to this government that we have been perhaps too hasty in these matters. I believe these two decisions have given us the grounds for saying that we are competent, as a Provincial Government and as a Provincial Legislature, to enact whatever amendments are necessary to the farm marketing legislation.

Our farm marketing legislation in this province has never been declared invalid. The situation up to the present is that except for one instance, on which there is yet no decision, the marketing legislation is not being challenged.

Therefore, I am suggesting to the House this afternoon that it may be that we have been a bit too hasty in regard to shunting off to the Supreme Court of Canada a matter on which we were fully competent. There has been nothing said to me in this House or anywhere which would constitute in my mind a reason why we in this province are not the masters in our own House, in respect to marketing legislation. There has been no decision otherwise. There has been no decision which would lead us to believe that we could not enact amendments to our marketing legislation in this House, and make them "stick."

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that we ought to use the resources at our command, and within our purview, rather than passing all things holus-

bolus to the Supreme Court of Canada for interpretation.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I reply to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition which, I must say, do not display any indication of intensive study of the problem.

Our studies and our work in connection with this matter have involved many, many sessions with the Federation of Agriculture, which I think you will agree is one of the most outstanding farm organizations in this province.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister will get no argument from me on that.

HON. MR. FROST: I would support my argument by repeating that we have collaborated and studied this matter with them and with Mr. Harris, the solicitor for that organization, and the solicitors for many of the farm organizations. I refer to Mr. Harris from St. Catharines, not hon. Mr. Harris from Grey County.

MR. OLIVER: Either one would be a good authority.

HON. MR. FROST: That might be, but I am referring to the very well-known authority in connection with farm legislation.

The action which we have taken in this matter is by no means hasty; it is something which has been brought about after a very thorough consideration of this problem with farm organizations, and particularly with the Federation of Agriculture. It has involved having at our discussions in Ottawa, Mr. Harris, the solicitor for a number of farm organizations, and who has also been counsel for many matters connected with the Federation of Agriculture.

I would like to assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that this has never been a case of "holus-bolus reference of these matters to the Supreme Court of Canada for decision." It has been very carefully discussed not only in this

province with our own farm organizations, but the other provinces of Canada—as the hon. Minister of Agriculture will tell you—in conferences with the Agricultural Ministers and with the Premiers of the various provinces. Those discussions culminated in a series of discussions in the last Federal-Provincial Conference, concerning this very complicated matter.

There have been differences of points of view in connection with the various powers of the various provinces.

I quite agree there are points in the decisions in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia which might be held to be favourable to our position here. There are always uncertainties. It must be remembered that all of these cases have been decided upon different premises, and the decisions which have been rendered in any of the cases must be considered in the light of the fundamentals which were referred to the court before the judgments could be taken as applying to the conditions we have here, or those in some of the other provinces.

The basic difficulty which we face, not only in Ontario, but in the other provinces of Canada—and the other governments are vitally concerned with what we are doing and our method of approach which has been discussed with representatives of most of the provinces—has been that there are unquestionably uncertainties regarding provincial jurisdiction, not only in our province, but also in other provinces.

We are all desirous of finding ways in which the provinces can support the farm people in their organizations. I do not think there is very much difference of opinion in regard to that anywhere in Canada.

The problem is this: consider a great plan, such as concerns hog marketing, which constituted a new approach to this problem on a province-wide basis. It is not a small problem which can be resolved overnight. It involves the livelihood and economic circumstances of tens of thousands of our people, and it involves financial operations of very great magnitude.

These organizations entered into it in good faith, believing that the law was “thus and so.” These are very large organizations involving assets of millions of dollars, and very great financial outlays, and it would be an extremely serious matter if that legislation were declared invalid, say, in the month of August, or at some other critical time when perhaps the whole farm marketing plan in connection with that important organization could be thrown into chaos.

MR. OLIVER: What reason is there to think it would be invalid?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. leader of the Opposition might discuss the legal points involved in that with Mr. Harris or with officials of our own Attorney-General's Department whom I will make available to him for discussion of this problem.

There is also another point, and this is, at the present time we have a number of plans in Ontario covering, on an area or regional basis, from 30 to 35 different commodities, and the decision in regard to one might very vitally affect the marketing of some of these other products. This could easily be at the very time the crop was available to market, which would throw the whole situation into chaos.

This matter was discussed in conference. A number of provinces were vitally concerned, and keenly interested in it, because they are affected by the same problems we have in Ontario.

The history briefly is this: in 1935—as a matter of fact it goes back before that date—the then Federal Government passed a Natural Products Marketing Act. That was taken as being opposed to provincial jurisdiction. The Provincial Government here at that time argued that this particular Act was *ultra vires* of the Federal Government and the matter was referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

As a matter of fact, for a great many years, the matter remained in a state of uncertainty, and it was during that period that a great deal of legislation was passed in Ontario, believed to be



within the competence of the Provincial Legislature. It was passed by the government of which the hon. leader of the Opposition was a member; and by subsequent governments, and was passed by this government.

The question might be asked why, in 1956, after a period of quiescence of some 20 years, has this matter again come into issue? It is because of the great expansion of farm marketing in these past few years. In the past few years a very great number of matters have come into this sphere of farm marketing, including the hog marketing scheme.

It is true that the same doubts in connection with The Milk Control Act could have been raised 10 years ago, but the fact is they were not raised until the recent Brampton case. The hon. leader of the Opposition referred to this a moment ago, which came about by a decision of the court, along the lines of what the hon. leader of the Opposition stated it to be. Nevertheless, it is unfortunately only one of a series of cases which have arisen, not only in this province, but elsewhere, in relation to the validity of the Acts, but also as to the jurisdiction of the provinces to legislate in these matters. The situation was this, Mr. Speaker—

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister allow me to refer to the Brampton case? Is there any doubt in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister as to the competency of this Legislature?

HON. MR. FROST: No, there is not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: I certainly have no doubt, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I think we have very good grounds for feeling that another court might sustain our legislation.

May I point out that we are referring this legislation to the court, as we feel that by carrying this case in appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, probably by June—or perhaps earlier—the Legis-

lature will be able to meet with a clear interpretation of this matter, and enact legislation which we will then consider will be within the competence of this Legislature.

I think it is desirable that the Brampton case—the Milk Board case—should be considered collateral with the other cases, which will have to be determined at that time, and in the light of the decision of the court.

May I give the history of the situation? First of all, there were certain questions raised. This government promised the farmers of Ontario it would support their marketing plans by legislation, defend them in the courts, and attempt, if necessary, to obtain complementary legislation at Ottawa, and as a last resort, to endeavour to obtain a constitutional amendment to support them. That has been our position.

We have followed that procedure, and have kept the first promise; we have defended them in the courts, and we propose to continue doing so. We propose to support the farm organizations in the matter of farm marketing. We have no intention of having our farmers placed in a position where they have to defend this legislation against all sorts of interests, and incur all manner of costs. We have said we will do that, and we will.

Secondly, Mr. Harris, through the Federation at Ottawa—that is, its Ottawa branch—and our own Ontario Federation, as well as other branches in Canada, proposed to the Federal Government that certain legislation should be enacted which would be complementary to ours. There was wide acceptance of that point of view.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) knows the course which was taken in regard to that matter. Some of the provinces, including our own, made the proposal to the Federal Government that it should enact legislation which would, with certain safeguards, provide a unified position for the Federal and Provincial Governments to take care of this marketing problem, in areas in which the jurisdiction was

vague and indistinct, as between the powers of the two governments.

Last spring in Ottawa we went so far as to agree to that. The legislation was drawn and agreed to; the legislative requirements at Ottawa were worded very simply, and appeared to solve this problem. The Federal Government went so far as to agree to this, and there was even an announcement made in the Press to that effect. As a matter of fact, I met hon. Mr. Gardiner in Toronto, and congratulated him on meeting the requirements of the provinces, and I certainly thought—and I think he did also—that the matter was settled to the satisfaction of everyone. But, some time in July, the Federal Government decided not to pass this legislation and these amendments. In the meantime, we had placed this whole vexed problem on the agenda at the Federal-Provincial Conference in April. The proceedings are here to be read by the hon. members of the House, if they so desire.

In October, we were advised that in connection with what we had understood in April had been agreed upon between ourselves, along with some of the other provinces, and with Ottawa—that is, that legislation which would be complementary to ours would be passed—we were advised that the Federal Government had revised its decision and had decided not to pass the necessary legislation.

MR. MacDONALD: Why?

HON. MR. FROST: I am coming to that. I will explain that in a moment. I brought the subject up on October 3 last, when the Federal-Provincial Conference convened. We had with us at that time representatives of some of the farm organizations in Ontario, who were very familiar with the entire situation, including Mr. Harris, who sat with our solicitors and counsel during the discussion.

The argument advanced by the head of the Federal Government, and by the Justice Department and others, was that it was felt that owing to the uncertain nature of the legislation which had

been enacted in Canada, the uncertain position of that legislation in regard to its validity if questioned in the courts—of course, we could argue that our legislation was alright in the Milk Board case—and due to those uncertainties, the Federal Government felt it would be undesirable to enter into the field of complementing our legislation, or passing legislation which would strengthen our own, if there was not a clear line of demarcation as to where these uncertainties lay.

I am sure hon. members will realize that we could discuss this with a number of the leading counsels of the country, and secure differences in points of view as to the meaning of the section of The British North America Act having to do with this very complicated and very important problem.

At that time, as is well known, I argued—and was supported by a number of the other hon. Premiers in relation to this matter—that we should not be placed in the position of entering into marketing agreements which, because of some decision involving one of the provinces across Canada, might be thrown into the discard. These things involve assets totalling millions of dollars, and the lives and economic well-being of tens of thousands of our citizens, not only in Ontario, but elsewhere.

The result was that the suggestion was made at that time that the Federal Government would assist in submitting a case to the Supreme Court of Canada for a decision. That presented very many advantages to the provincial position, for this reason; instead of having to wait for, say, the Brampton case to start in a junior court, and go through the various courts of appeal, finally ending up in the Supreme Court as one isolated phase of the great problem of farm marketing, we would be able to secure a decision on all of these questions from the highest court in the land.

With this decision we and all the provinces would be able—as, indeed, would the Federal Government—to enact legislation to strengthen our position, and meet the requirements, not only in this province, but elsewhere.

That seemed to be a sensible and reasonable decision to make, and the decision was made after very many consultations with the federal authorities.

I quite agree that any arrangement we arrived at last April—which I thought the hon. Mr. Gardiner was going to carry out; in fact, he did say he was going to carry it out, but which the Federal Government reversed during the summer—was reversed for a very good reason. I do not think its attitude was unreasonable. They had a decision to support, and, after all, it is probably unwise for one legislative body to pass legislation in support of another legislative body, unless it clearly understands what the conditions are.

I could not disagree with The Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent or hon. Mr. Garson, or others, in that connection. It seems to me there was reason and judgment to support that point of view.

After being advised of its decision, we were faced with the problem of deciding whether we were going to wait until some person would, with some minor case, upset all the machinery—or should we try to hold steady for the time being, and submit the whole question to the court, and find out what the court's decision would be, and then make a move which we hope will settle this matter for all time? That was the situation with which we were faced.

In connection with the submission which has been made, I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that the nature of the questions asked should be submitted to this Legislature. These questions, of course, are public property, as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows. They have been submitted to the court, and form part of the public records of Canada at the present time.

However, I will arrange to have the submission tabled in this House where hon. members, who are concerned, may study the questions which were asked.

As a matter of fact, it gets down to a fairly simple proposition of stating a case containing certain regulations, and asking whether they are valid in whole

or in part. The proposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition is to avoid the submitting of The Marketing Act, which may have sections too broad in its intention, by passing amending legislation to straighten out existing legislation and correct its meaning, so that when the decision is given in relation to that, specific reference can be made to the Statute which is in effect here.

I would not want to have a decision on something which perhaps went off on a different tangent, or on some different interpretation which was not intended by the Legislature.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think explains the situation. I will be very glad to show the submission to any hon. member of the House who cares to see it. The proceedings at the conference can be read, and, of course, the matter was referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

I think it would be very unwise, at this time, to pass amendments to what may prove to be bad legislation. It would seem to be much better to hold the whole thing over until we have the decision of the Supreme Court, after which time the Legislature will be immediately convened.

I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that we have the best counsel we can employ engaged at the present time in taking apart all of our farm marketing legislation, and studying it all, so that in the event of some questions being raised, we will have the answers. In that way, there will be no delay in bringing this legislation before this Assembly for consideration, at the earliest possible date after the rendering of the Supreme Court judgment. That is about the situation as I see it.

As regards our policy in the future; it is this: I hope the questions which will be submitted to the Supreme Court will clarify this matter once and for all. It is a complicated matter, and we have taken the very best advice we can secure; we have collaborated with the farm organizations, and every possible point we think can be considered has been included in these questions.



In addition to that, the Government of Canada is, of course, represented by The Department of Justice. Every one of the 10 provinces will be represented at this hearing, and I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that amongst those vitally interested in this are Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, where there is a potato case involved, and British Columbia, which has several marketing plans. All of the western provinces are vitally interested in this very important matter.

I think, from the standpoint of securing a decision, the matter will be covered once and for all. I may be indulging in wishful thinking in assuming that all the questions can be asked at this hearing. But I think substantially that will be true, and I think then we will have clarified the situation.

As to the cures: I would say they are, first, the clarification of this matter by the Supreme Court to enable us to pass legislation here, and to be passed in the other provinces, within the competence of the provinces of Canada to pass such legislation.

Secondly, in regard to the important point of the Federal Government passing complementary legislation, to which I have referred, I think that once the submission is clarified and the doubts have been resolved, we can ask the Federal Government to support our farm legislation, on request, with certain enactments.

Thirdly, if necessary we would have to have an amendment to our Constitution. I am one of those who, without reservation, believe we should be able to amend our Constitution here in Canada. I would like to see that done. I have consistently supported that point of view. I believe it is not in keeping with the dignity of our nation to have the constitutional situation as we have it today. I have done my best to bring about what I thought were very desirable results, and I have been fully supported by the present hon. Treasurer, who at that time was the hon. Attorney-General, and who is very familiar with what has taken place.

MR. MacDONALD: You are certainly progressive Conservatives.

HON. MR. FROST: I am a Progressive Conservative. That is the Party of the people.

A constitutional amendment is not easy to obtain, by any means. It involves very great difficulties at the present time. To obtain a constitutional amendment, first of all, there has to be an agreement amongst all the provinces, and I presume the federal authority would hesitate to support an amendment which might create division in the country, for that can happen in connection with a constitutional amendment.

To obtain the passage of an amendment, it is necessary for the House of Commons—and I think the Senate—at Ottawa to send an address to the Parliament at Westminster, asking them to make certain changes. Usually, when that is done, the Parliament at Westminster acquiesces and passes the necessary amendment.

But the hon. members can readily see that in a matter as complicated as the one with which we are dealing now, the passage of a constitutional amendment requiring positive agreement between the 11 governments concerned—10 provincial governments, and the Government of Canada—is not easy to achieve at all. I can assure the hon. members it is a very difficult matter.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would think in the end, the best way of supporting farm legislation would be by agreement between the provinces and the Federal Government to pass complementary legislation. That would seem to be the most sensible and the most direct method of handling this complicated matter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that gives the explanation asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I will be glad to hand him the proceedings of the conference at Ottawa, and the submissions and discussions in connection with such proceedings.

I may say that many of the discussions were not printed. They were more

or less in-camera discussions. But what took place after the matter was discussed in plenary conferences, at the two meetings in April and October, was that the matter was referred to a sub-committee, upon which were representatives of the federal Department of Agriculture—its solicitor, as a matter of fact—in company with representatives from the other provinces. That was when the amendment to which I have referred, and which we thought was going to pass, was drafted, and which we thought was to be presented to Parliament for enactment.

Subsequently, in October, when the matter again came up, and the reasons for reversing the decision were discussed, the matter was again referred to the law officers of each province, who once more discussed it with the representatives of The Department of Justice, and the upshot of it was an agreement that the questions were to be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, I believe, on or about April 24.

May I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I believe I have given the explanation of this matter. The proceedings will be available to the hon. leader of the Opposition. There is nothing secret about them; they have been discussed quite widely, and there may be some suggestion made as to a way in which these matters could be presented. If so, I would be glad to receive any advice, because I again assure the hon. leader of the Opposition, and you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of very great complexity, and at the same time, a matter of the utmost importance to the people of our province.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I add a word on this subject? I find myself in agreement with both the thought and the action of the Progressive Conservative Government here, and the Liberals at Ottawa, and this is such a rare occasion that I feel I should comment upon it.

HON. MR. FROST: Sometimes we do agree, the hon. member knows.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right, sir. I think, if I may refer to the line of thinking of the hon. leader of the Opposition on this subject, that events may prove him to be right in that the full powers lie with us here.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacDONALD: But we cannot be sure and, at the present time throughout the whole agricultural community of the Province of Ontario, people are living in the shadows of uncertainty with regard to this whole problem of marketing.

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite right.

MR. MacDONALD: It is bedevilling their whole thought and action.

HON. MR. THOMAS: What suggestion for improvement would the hon. member put forward, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MacDONALD: I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that we should end, once and for all, the uncertainty on this issue, so that we can move forward in building our marketing machinery more effectively.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the hon. member says, with this exception, that when he says we should "end once and for all," I would point out to the hon. Prime Minister and to the hon. member, that in regard to these things there is no "end once and for all." It is an evolution, it goes on and on and on, and it all depends upon what the hon. Prime Minister has included in the submission to the Supreme Court. It may be that he has, in that submission, encompassed all the important things which will come up, and it may be that he has missed others. If he has missed some, then when we come back to the Legislature of Ontario to enact legislation, somebody the next day can go to the courts again and upset the whole matter.

There is no use saying there is any finality about the thing. This is just a chapter in the progress, if it is that, and I hope most sincerely it is.

HON. MR. FROST: I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that the reference should be in the fullest terms, and that is what we have endeavoured to do. We have the thoughts not only of our own people—and by that I mean those who are or have been law officers and solicitors for the various farm organizations—but we also have in this group other people who are very much concerned with this problem. As a result I think the questions will be framed to meet every possible chance of ambiguity and any possibility of furthering any of these uncertainties.

When I say "others who are concerned," I am referring, for instance, to the Government of Nova Scotia. The hon. Premier and the hon. Attorney-General of that province raised a point which, as a matter of fact, had not been considered in connection with the amendment which had been agreed upon by the law officers both here and at Ottawa, and that was concerning some obscure matters in relation to the delegation of authority as between federal and provincial governments.

I was very much impressed with the submission made by the hon. Attorney-General of Nova Scotia in regard to this complicated matter, and I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that I think we have taken every precaution to see that every possibility is covered.

I will see that this is tabled, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition and the leader of the CCF Party both receive copies of the proceedings, and if there are questions which have not been asked, which are within the purview of this conference, I shall be glad to have them considered, because I think it is very important that we should end the aura of uncertainty which has existed in connection with the matter.

MR. OLIVER: I know this is out of order, Mr. Speaker, but the thing which has upset me in regard to this whole

matter is the decision of the government to refer The Milk Control Act to the Supreme Court. To me that sort of makes light of the whole proposition, because no one in this Legislature would say for one moment that we are not competent to deal with amendments to The Milk Control Act which would allow it to proceed along the course we want it to follow in this province.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition will agree that there are certain things in connection with this matter which make the course adopted desirable. As a matter of fact, in the lower courts the decisions were favourable, and upheld the legislation, then the matter went to the Supreme Court of Ontario and the decision of the lower court was reversed.

The problem involved in The Milk Control Act concerns some of the vital matters which we will have to consider in connection with farm legislation later on, and I think it would be wholly undesirable to deal with that one facet of the problem now, and leave the principal items over until next spring. The sensible thing would appear to be to refer this to the Supreme Court of Canada which will be considering these other marketing matters next April, and thus secure a determination on the whole matter and we will then be able to consider solutions to the whole problem, when the Legislature next meets.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### JUNIOR FARMER ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Hon. F. S. Thomas moves second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the original Act in 1952 provided \$10 million for capital expenditure in the form of loans to junior farmers between the ages of 21 and 35. We have now expended in excess of the \$10 million and, therefore, in the amendment to this Bill I am



asking that the \$10 million amount be increased to \$20 million. That is the primary consideration in the amendment to this Act.

The other consideration, Mr. Speaker, has to do with joint tenants and owners, in other words, where there is a man 37 years old and his wife 35, either the joint tenant-owners or the individual, according to the age limit, may apply for a loan and such application would be considered by the board.

Therefore, in moving second reading of this Bill, those are the main points, unless there are some questions in principle about which hon. members wish to ask.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, on this Bill the opportunity presents itself for saying a word or two on the broad subject of the parent Act itself, which this Bill seeks to amend.

In respect to farm loans under The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, the board—and of course the moving spirit of the board emanates from the government—has been too tough in appraising these farms for loan purposes. I do not imagine that the government has lost a single cent so far in the transactions of this board.

HON. MR. THOMAS: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: And I doubt, if the government continues its present method, they will ever lose anything. That means that from a solid business point of view, they are as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar. There is no question about that.

But from the viewpoint of providing very necessary credit to the young farmers of this province, I should say at the very least, they are over cautious. I know of many instances—and I think other hon. members can bear me out in this—where the valuation of a farm for loan purposes was very low indeed. It seems to me that in this matter we can afford not to be overly generous, but to be more generous than we have been.

Another matter upon which I should like to say a word in this connection,

Mr. Speaker, is that there is a closing-off date which comes early in the fall, whether the snow is there or not.

HON. MR. THOMAS: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Last fall, for instance, the hon. Minister's closing date was so early—either that or the snow was so late, I do not know which it was—

HON. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, may I reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition?

MR. OLIVER: No, sir, I am not going to give way to the hon. Minister for a minute. He is in good talking humour this afternoon, I can see that.

MR. THOMAS: I always am.

MR. OLIVER: This closing date which the hon. Minister arbitrarily applies on the valuation of farms for loan purposes seems to me to be an unrealistic one. There is no need whatever of saying that from "the first of October," or whatever date it is, there shall be no appraisals made, that the "deal is off" for that year. That could go on for some time past the date arbitrarily set by the hon. Minister.

When this matter comes up in committee, I—and I hope other hon. members of the Opposition—will take the opportunity which is then presented of analyzing in a very realistic way some of the shortcomings of this board in dealing with the young farmers in the Province of Ontario.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition may I say that this board has done quite a good job. I think he will agree with that. The manager is the appointee of the Party which he represents, appointed in 1944, and if there are any mistakes, they are due to him and not the board.

MR. OLIVER: Oh no.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Yes, they are. Furthermore, may I point out that the County of Wellington received 118

loans, and the next county in that respect was the County of Grey with 114. May I further state to the hon. leader of the Opposition that the closing date was not arbitrary. I arranged that it be established in relation to the amount of snow which was on the ground in any particular area during the past year. And if anybody can prove differently, I shall be glad to have them do so in the Committee on Agriculture when this Bill is being considered.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister re-state that?

HON. MR. THOMAS: Yes, I said I told the board that the closing date for loans would be at a date when snow covered the ground, so that one could not make an appraisal of the land, and if anybody has any point to prove other than that, then it is due to the administration by a former administrator, appointed under a previous government, and not to the policy which I laid down.

MR. OLIVER: Really, Mr. Speaker, I have heard hon. Ministers of the government go a long way in trying to defend an indefensible position, but never in my public life have I heard an otherwise responsible Minister of the Crown get up and say that if there are shortcomings and faults, they do not belong to any of his political stripe, but to the one who made the appointment long ago.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the indoctrination which the hon. Minister has practiced on this chap should have swayed him. If not the Minister should give up, because our friend is not going to bend now, if he has not done so thus far.

HON. MR. THOMAS: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I have laid down a policy, and if any policy has not been carried out, it was not the one I laid down. And if the hon. leader of the Opposition can prove one case in Ontario to the contrary, it is not due to any policy which I laid down.

MR. OLIVER: May I enquire what the hon. Minister is prepared to do if I prove a case like that?

HON. MR. THOMAS: I am prepared to fire the fellow you appointed.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. leader of the Opposition is away out on a limb now.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Minister has got me "coming and going" on that one.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Certainly I have the hon. leader of the Opposition "coming and going," I have him "coming and going" on everything as far as that is concerned.

As I said before, may I point out again that the County of Wellington received 118 loans amounting in all to \$789,300, and that Grey County received 114 loans—which places it in second position—which loans amounted to \$623,275. And the hon. leader of the Opposition knows full well that he never came to me, nor to any member of the board, that his case has not been considered and reviewed, and some were reviewed in his favour.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister how he could have appointed years ago an official to administer this Act, when the Act was only placed on the Statute Book a matter of two years ago?

HON. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is obvious. The hon. member for Brant knows that the administrator of this board is a brother of Senator Fraser from Ottawa.

MR. NIXON: Then the hon. Minister or his predecessor must have appointed him to administer this Act, because we did not.

MR. OLIVER: Did the hon. Minister know that at the time?

HON. MR. THOMAS: Certainly I did.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman in question was an official of my department for many, many years.

MR. OLIVER: May I enquire what the hon. Prime Minister said?

HON. MR. FROST: I said that the gentleman in question was an official of my department, that is the Treasury Department, for many years, and that he is a very fine fellow and does a very good job.

MR. OLIVER: Good for you.

HON. MR. FROST: May I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that this gentleman has done a good job in connection with The Junior Farmers Act. As he knows, it has always been a difficult problem, it was so in the days of the old—what was it called?

MR. NIXON: The Agricultural Development Act.

HON. MR. FROST: The Agricultural Development Act, which the hon. member for Brant had a good deal to do with in pitching out, because he and his Party felt that our administration of it was perhaps a little, I was going to say "too liberal," sir, with a small "l".

MR. OLIVER: Liberalism came under the Tories in that case.

HON. MR. FROST: We were accused of being too generous. As a result, the whole Act was repealed. In any event this Junior Farmers Act has been well administered. It is a difficult problem. Nevertheless, the hon. Minister of Agriculture knows that very generous provisions for credit are contained in the Act and I think it has been very wisely and well administered. Indeed, if the hon. leader of the Opposition will look at the number of loans provided in his own riding, he will agree that it is pretty good, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. THOMAS: 114, the second highest.

MR. OLIVER: I am thinking of the other fellow.

HON. MR. FROST: I know, but a few days ago the hon. leader of the Opposition was complaining in this

House that we have devious ways of extending benefits to ridings which are represented by government supporters. May I point out to him, that, perhaps with one exception, there have been more loans made in this connection in his own riding than in any other in Ontario.

MR. MacDONALD: It looks as though he has influence with the administration.

HON. MR. FROST: No. Of course, we try to treat them all fairly.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves second reading of Bill No. 85, "The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956."

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing contentious about this legislation. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the leader of the CCF Party cannot help but concur.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, revises The Co-operative Marketing Loans Act with the following changes in principle. The name is changed by deleting the word "marketing" so that the purpose for which a co-operative association is organized need not be limited to marketing.

It will also avoid confusion with The Farm Products Marketing Act. A board is to be established to be known as the Co-operative Marketing Loans Board. This board will administer the Act, receive and investigate all applications, and make recommendations with respect to loans.

As formerly, loans will be made and guarantees of bank loans will be authorized by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Provision is made for loans up to \$100,000, but no loan may exceed 50 per cent. of the value of the real property owned by a co-operative association.



Coming now to the matter of cold storage plants; may I interject that we never loan on a cold storage plant unless Ottawa provides the grant which they make to cold storage plants, both co-operative and private. The present ceiling, therefore, on loans is \$65,000 for cold storage plants, and \$15,000 for other co-operatives.

These amounts have proven to be inadequate when compared with the cost of buildings and equipment today in relation to those of 25 years ago when the present Act was written. Loans will be secured by a first mortgage on the property of the co-operative association.

To ensure that control of its ownership and operation of any co-operative in cases where a loan is made, or a guarantee given, remains with the producers until the loan is repaid, an agreement shall be entered into between the Minister and the co-operative. For the better securing of a loan the board is authorized to require a chattel mortgage at the time the loan is made or the guarantee is given. May I point out that is not mandatory. The board is simply authorized to do that, under certain conditions.

Application of the Act is extended to any organization other than a co-operative for the purpose of providing cold storage facilities—and be it noted that that is not an ordinary co-operative but only one with cold storage facilities—for producers of farm products where the majority of the issued shares of its capital stock is held by primary agricultural producers.

Following is a report of loans outstanding and bank guarantees in force at the present time:

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Number of loans outstanding .....           | 74          |
| Number of bank guarantees<br>in force ..... | 11          |
| Amount of loans outstanding .....           | \$1,395,094 |
| Amount of guarantees in force ....          | 485,750     |

The above totals are made up of:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 22 loans to cold storages .....                   | \$ 903,478 |
| 52 loans to other co-operatives ....              | 491,616    |
| 4 bank guarantees to<br>cold storages .....       | 382,250    |
| 7 bank guarantees to other<br>co-operatives ..... | 103,500    |

Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation and I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, there is one question I would like to ask, and I will explain first why I am asking it: of whom will the personnel of this board consist? Will it be someone within the department, or someone from outside? The reason I am asking is this; I do not know whether it is in the government's mind that one of the purposes of this Bill is to remove any possibility, as might be in the minds of the public, that political influence is required to secure loans. In the past, that has been the case.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Where?

MR. MacDONALD: I can cite you an instance.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Where?

MR. MacDONALD: In Kenora, with a co-operative.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Name it.

MR. MacDONALD: Just wait a minute, and you will know who it is, because he is a "buddy" of the hon. Minister. An amount of \$15,000 was granted for a plant there.

HON. MR. THOMAS: What plant?

MR. MacDONALD: The Co-operative Milk Plant, which was established last spring.

HON. MR. THOMAS: What is illegal about it?

MR. MacDONALD: If you want to interrupt, go ahead, but I will persist until I finish. The point was that the co-operative was in straitened financial circumstances, as is often the case when people come together to establish a "co-op." They had made application and the local Conservative candidate while in Toronto phoned back reporting to these people that they were going to get a loan of \$5,000 and the remainder would be considered at a later date.

I am not criticizing officials in your department, I am defending them on this. People in Kenora got in touch with me, and wanted to know what went on with this issue. They said they were entitled to it, and had been assured they were going to get it. I called the appropriate official in your department and was told it had been authorized and was on your desk for signature.

The significant point was, while that was happening, the local Conservative candidate was telling the people in that area that they were going to get \$5,000 and the balance after the election. If you think I am wrong, just check and you will find that this is what happened.

If the purpose of this Act is to set up a board—I come back to my original question—will this board act independently of political consideration or will its activities be tied in with a “Tory” Party machine for its own purposes? If the purpose of the Bill is this, it is a very good purpose and I hope it can be fulfilled.

HON. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I say that I accept full responsibility for that telephone conversation. I had to do with that co-operative and no such deal was made and before the election they received their full loan of \$15,000, and I have the records to prove it in my office.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not saying they did not get it.

HON. MR. THOMAS: You said the inference was that they were promised \$5,000 at once, and \$10,000 after the election. That is not true. They received the full amount of the loan.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, let me repeat if the hon. Minister did not “get it”, I am not criticizing his department, I am not saying the co-operative did not get it. In fact, when I enquired I found it had been authorized. I am defending the department for a moment, but what I am not defending is the tactics of a

local Conservative candidate who was trying to dangle this in front of them before the election, with the prospect that they would not receive the complete loan until after the election.

HON. MR. THOMAS: That is not true. The truth is they got the loan. I saw to it that they received it. I, and my officials, are responsible for it, within the terms of the Act. The candidate may have said what he liked, but the fact is, they received the loan, and the hon. member knows better than to say what he has said.

MR. MacDONALD: Alright, it is clear.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): In section 6 of this Act, it says the rate of interest payable on a loan under the Act shall be determined at the time the loan is made. Does that mean the rate on one loan may be a little different from another?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. This question will come up in committee. I will not permit it at this time.

HON. MR. THOMAS: I am prepared to answer it.

HON. MR. FROST: Possibly it might affect the principle of the Bill.

HON. MR. THOMAS: I am prepared to answer that. The terms on which the interest may be based depend on the length of the loan. Ordinarily, a 20-year loan is at 4 per cent., and on a shorter loan there is a higher percentage of interest, if that answers the hon. member.

MR. OLIVER: Is the rate of interest uniform as between the different classes the hon. Minister enumerates? I mean, the short-term loan, is that at 4 per cent. and the longer at 5 per cent?

HON. MR. THOMAS: The longer term on a junior loan is 5 per cent. The same is in effect on the marketing loan under The Co-operative Loans Act.

MR. OLIVER: I would suggest that should be set out in the legislation. The legislation you ask the House to approve today says that the rate of interest may be determined at the time the loan is granted, and I suggest that gives all kinds of leeway where you may charge one 3 per cent. and one 5 per cent. according to your political affiliations, as the hon. member for York South says.

HON. MR. THOMAS: The hon. leader of the Opposition knows better.

MR. OLIVER: But seriously, why should it not be set out in the Act if there are two classes of loans and two only, and a different rate applies to one than to the other? Why should it not be set out specifically in the Act?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that I think in this case the matter of the cost of money enters into it. The House knows there has been a great deal of variation in the cost of money in the last few years.

In 1950, for instance, the bank rate was lower; there was a support, for instance, for Victory Bonds in the country, and the bank rate was about 3 per cent. for long-term money. Subsequently, I think in December of that year, there was a change, with the result that the cost of money went up for a time to nearly  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Then came certain other changes with reductions of the bank rate, with the falling of the interest rate, with the result that for a very considerable period of time we again borrowed money at around 3 per cent.

At the present time, with the tightening of the bank rate, I think there are further indications of a rise in the bank rate overseas, the interest rates have again gone up, as far as we are concerned, on long-term money to something in the neighbourhood of 4 per cent.

I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that in this case again the matter of the cost of money enters into it. You cannot have a fixed rate.

MR. OLIVER: I do not know why you cannot. The hon. Prime Minister says the rate of money varies from month to month or year to year, and the hon. Prime Minister is suggesting because of this variation there would also be a variation in the interest rate charged in The Co-operative Loans Act. Surely the hon. Prime Minister does not mean that. The Junior Farmer Establishment Act about which we were talking a little while ago has the interest rates set out in it.

HON. MR. THOMAS: May I inform the hon. leader of the Opposition that on a 20-year loan, under The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, the rate is 4 per cent., but it varies for a shorter term.

MR. OLIVER: That is alright. What I am trying to say is that it is set, that under The Junior Farmer Establishment Act at 4 per cent. for some, and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for others. That interest rate does not vary with the ebb and flow of the money market, nor the fluctuations therein.

I say the argument of the hon. Prime Minister in this case does not hold water. He is not going to suggest to the House this afternoon that because interest rates vary in the money markets of the world in which we deal, they also vary in the interest charged under The Co-operative Loans Act.

HON. MR. FROST: I think this section is a good one. I see some of the financial men in the Gallery, and I will ask them about it. This section says:

The rate of interest payable on a loan under this Act shall be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, at the time the loan is made.

I think it is a wise provision. May I point out that these loans to co-operative companies go up to \$100,000. These loans are really an additional bank facility, a bank loan may be for a certain time on a certain rate, perhaps 6 months later it will be increased. It is a commercial loan to a co-operative which is



a commercial company, and I think the company should have the advantage of that; if you are going to set a rate, I think a fair tendency would be to set a rate which would take care of the various fluctuations. I think it is a wise provision and I do not think I would argue against it. I think it is in the interest of the co-operatives.

MR. OLIVER: Your argument is better than it was a while ago.

HON. MR. THOMAS: In addition to these loans, the government guarantees bank loans at a 4 per cent. rate of interest, so they have a double-barrelled gun to deal with co-operatives or groups which are primarily supported by the producer, and the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, as well as I do, that is a strong point which was not in existence previous to this time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### BEACH PROTECTION ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly (Minister of Mines) moves second reading of Bill No. 57, "An Act to amend The Beach Protection Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that this will be referred to the Committee on Mining. A meeting has been arranged for all those interested in the removal of sand and gravel from Lake Erie, for next Wednesday morning in Committee Room No. 2 at 10 o'clock. Due notice has been given to all the municipalities along the Lake Erie front, and along certain frontages of Lake Ontario.

The problem of gravel removal from Lake Erie has gone on over many years, it has its supporters and those who do not agree with it, and the idea of this committee is to resolve the problem into the best interests of all concerned.

The amendment, as we bring it down, will affect the removal of all sand and gravel from Lake Erie in that a licence will be required to remove it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the hon. Minister to refuse the issuing of licences until this legislation is approved by the Legislature?

HON. MR. KELLY: All people removing sand or gravel from the lake will require a licence. We have had representations over the past few years, that this be done, from various municipalities and residents along the lakeshore. We have also had indications that certain rights and privileges granted were being abused, and we feel we should give this matter a good deal of supervision to see that there is no injury occasioned to those property owners along the lake.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister did not get my question. What I would like to know is this: he has known for some time that this legislation would be introduced at this session of the Legislature. May I ask if, in the last month, any licences have been issued to anyone for the dredging of sand in the lakes?

HON. MR. KELLY: I am given to understand—and I believe it is right—that no new licences have been issued. We in Ontario have provision for the removal of sand and gravel at distances  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles from the shoreline. I would like to inform the House that on the other side of Lake Erie, the United States authorities permit sand and gravel to be removed within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of the shore of the lake, and in this regard we are not too sure that, in so doing, they are causing any great erosion along those beaches.

We do feel, and we are assured by those representatives who come to us, that our policy of removal from a distance of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles out does not affect the beaches on the Ontario side. There will be no new licences granted until this has been determined by the committee as to just what course we should take in the interests of those people.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon at adjournment, I was discussing the matter of "assessments," and had made the suggestion that normally it would be desirable there should be an over-all uniform assessment province-wide.

Turning to another phase of assessment, namely business assessment, which together with real property assessment constitutes the basis of municipal revenue, I would like to make some observations in that connection.

Under section 6 of The Assessment Act, there are a great number of categories of industries and commercial enterprises set out on a percentage basis, into which they fall severally for the purpose of setting up and creating business assessment. They range all the way from 25 per cent. minimum to a maximum of 150 per cent. of the real property assessment; which is applicable to a particular type of industry.

Over the years, there has been a great change in the type of land use or use of premises by various types of businesses. One of the great modifications which has come into being, of recent years, is the development of the supermarket. It used to be that the corner grocer, so to speak, supplied the needs locally for food purposes in any given community. Then the chain store operator came along and made it a little more difficult for the corner grocer to carry on, because of the fact that the large operator was able to sell his merchandise at lower prices.

Following on the general store operator, or in a more grandiose base, came along the supermarket. The supermarket has developed from that of handling a single type of commodity into a multi-commodity handling. In some cases, it has been categorized as a department store, for in some of them you may buy groceries, hardware articles, prepared medicines, etc.

Some industries are in different categories. The question in recent years has

developed along this line: why should one particular industry be taxed on a 150 per cent. business assessment basis, while another is on a 25 per cent. basis, and others may be assessed on a 50 or 75 per cent. basis, or on some other percentage?

Dealing with the matter of the supermarket for example, may I give the House some illustrations of some of the problems which have developed over recent months and years.

Thirty years ago, we were quite accustomed to have in our midst what we called a "wholesale business operation." An individual firm bought from a manufacturer, then sold and delivered the merchandise to a retailer, for which the operator made a handling charge, and carried on business operations as a wholesaler. In that connection, he fell into a 75 per cent. category.

Today, we have the supermarket or general store operator, who by-passes the wholesaler. He buys direct from the manufacturer and sets up his own warehouse and sells out of his own retail outlet. In other words, it is a manufacturer-retailer proposition, with the supermarket filling in between.

In that consideration, there is a problem; if operations were to expand in various types of industries, (a) as to the survival of the wholesaler group, (b) as to their ultimate necessity, and (c) the necessity of taking into consideration the survival of the individual proprietor-retailer outlet.

These are all problems which have an economic base. And this is something which does present a problem to us.

Getting back to the matter of business assessment, the setting up of or having set up, a uniform rate of business assessment, has been suggested by some business operators. By others, the suggestion has been: "We will not bother about the other fellow, so long as you reduce our category and bring us down to something less than we are now." We have not yet received any word from the one who is in a low category and who wants to be raised.

Since the turn of the century, when business assessment first came into being, the municipal councils, by and large, have counted upon business tax contributing in great measure or smaller measure to their respective municipal revenues.

If the business tax percentage of assessment is hit at some average or mean level, whereby those in a higher category are reduced, and those in a lower category are raised, of necessity it would mean that municipal-wise, there would be a depreciation in the amount of business tax to be obtained by municipal councils. Immediately following that, the question is: "Where is the differential or the loss to come from; who is going to play 'Santa Claus', if anybody?"

Last year, I had the opportunity of addressing the Ontario Mayors and Reeves Association in convention at North Bay, when this question was discussed. I posed the question to the elected representatives who were there at that time, that if any of them had any suggestions to offer whereby a solution might be had, either in whole or in part, I would be glad to receive it. Up to now, I have neither heard from nor received any reply from any municipal representative in that regard.

I have heard and received a great number of requests from those engaged in industry.

Another question which aggravates the situation somewhat is the fact that in Metropolitan Toronto, in the past 3 or 4 years particularly, and referring in great measure to the suburban assessments, they have increased very substantially. Of course, where you have these various percentages being made applicable for business assessment purposes, the increase in land assessment really does create a problem to the industrial life centred in Metropolitan Toronto.

If we forget about Metropolitan Toronto for a moment, and look at this picture on a provincial plane, one can readily appreciate the fact, as already indicated, that if one were to accede

to the requests of industry, money would have to come from some unknown source at the moment to relieve the municipalities, to make up for the so-called financial deficiency which would be occasioned as a result of the lowering of the various categories of assessment.

Right at the moment, I do not know just what the answer is, but there is a problem, and this problem is one which will have to be faced, and to which an answer must be found, if it is at all possible.

We have heard, over the years, that municipalities are in need of additional funds to carry on their current operations. Of course, if it were to be suggested that funds were to be taken away from them, the result would be that the municipalities would be in a somewhat greater plight than they are at the present time.

Consequently the matter of business assessment, linked up with the problem of preferential assessment I spoke about yesterday, is one of the major problems confronting both governments at the provincial and municipal levels.

I want to say a word about, not only The Assessment Act to which I have already referred, but also The Municipal Act.

The Municipal Act, as we all know, is the Statute which provides for the basis upon which municipalities function. They are the creatures of the province, their scope is limited according to the terms of the Statute, and they cannot exceed the authority therein contained.

It is a great many years since The Assessment Act or The Municipal Act were reviewed. One suggestion which I am going to make at this time is that The Municipal Act and The Assessment Act are two Statutes which of necessity are in need of revision and review in detail, from section 1 to the end of each of the Statutes, to see if it is not possible to streamline these Acts and to bring them up-to-date in accordance with the conditions in which we find ourselves in 1956, rather than leave



them in the state of antiquity where they have lain for a number of years.

Municipal councils over a period of time, and in some cases of which we know, have experienced difficulty, especially on nomination days, in not having personnel offer themselves for service by way of nomination. It is not an unknown thing that in some municipalities, nomination days have had to be postponed in order that sufficient nominations might be received from persons who are willing to take office, if elected.

Some of the reasons associated with this have become clear over the years. On the basis of a 12-months' duration of office, you no more than are elected and become acquainted with the problems of the local municipal council, when it is time to start preparing for the next election if you care to be a candidate again. It has been said in some quarters that, out of a total 12-months' duration of council office by an elected representative, approximately 3 to 4 months' maximum is afforded for attention to the affairs of the municipality, the other portion of the time, of necessity, being required (a) to become acquainted with the responsibility of the office, and (b) towards the latter portion of the year, in endeavouring to find time for oneself to be elected so that one may hold office for another year.

I think we are all fairly well cognizant of the fact that this is an unfortunate situation.

Coupled with this, of course, there is the fact I mentioned a moment ago. People who have business obligations, and who might otherwise be made available as candidates for municipal office, take the attitude: "Well, what is the use, you are only there for such a short period of time?"

If it were the case of a two-year term rather than one year, some of the difficulties to which I have just referred might be obviated. It would also act as an incentive to inspire persons, who may be interested in being elected to municipal office, to allow their names to stand for election; and instead of having 3 or 4 months' max-

imum service, they would have at least another 12 months added to that, whereby over a period of 24 months, there would be at least 16 or 17 months of service to the municipality. I think there is much to be said in favour of the extension to a two-year term.

In opposition to that, of course, it has been suggested that a poor candidate may be elected to office, and you may not want to have him there. The only and obvious answer to such a situation is that if an elector does not want to have a candidate elected, he should fulfill his obligation as a citizen and get out and vote on election day and help his candidate to be elected.

But what has been the experience of municipalities over the years? Not in any case that I can recall has there ever been a 100 per cent. vote in any municipality, but the general tenor of things has been that you may have a vote approximating 50 per cent. of the electors, but in many cases much less. If there should happen to be an acclamation in so far as the office of mayor, reeve, or other councillors are concerned, you have a "baker's dozen" coming out to vote either on by-laws or for candidates for some of the other municipal offices.

In other words, the responsibility of the citizen is taken a great deal more lightly than he otherwise would take it. Yesterday I had something to say about taxes and the burden of taxes. As we all know the dollars which come into the treasuries, whether they be of the federal, provincial or municipal treasury, all come from the pockets of the rate-payers or from corporations in one phase or another. It is interesting to note that over the years the percentage of the tax dollar which has been apportioned among the 3 levels of government, even in the year 1955, has not changed a great deal.

A few years ago it was thought the federal treasury received 77 per cent. of the tax dollar, and the provincial government and municipal government received the balance. In 1955 the situation is that the federal treasury receives

80 cents, the provincial government 6.3 cents, and the municipalities 13.7 cents out of every tax dollar. Therefore you can readily see that the federal government receives by far the greater portion of our tax dollar as we pay it as tax contributors. The province receives the least amount, and our municipalities in Ontario last year received something a little better than twice as much as the province from the tax dollar on a percentage basis.

From a municipal-council standpoint, as I said a moment ago, the council is restricted in its revenue obtained by business and real property taxes, a few licencing authorities or by-laws, and you have "had it."

It has also been stated that from a real estate standpoint, real estate has reached its peak as far as being responsible for additional taxes is concerned.

We heard it in 1955; we heard it in 1954; we also heard it in the 1930's and yet we all know that municipal taxes have increased regularly and steadily year by year for many years until now, and there is absolutely no guarantee they will not increase next year above this year. There is absolutely no guarantee that they will not increase. Yet, as I say, the maxim of real estate being taxed to the peak was applicable in the 1930's, it is applicable in the 1950's.

What is the difference? I will tell you what the difference is. Today our standard of living in Ontario has increased very substantially over what it was in the 1930's, for which we all thank God. None of us wants to go back to the "hungry thirties" from a living standard standpoint or from any standpoint. We want to progress, and in accordance with our increase in living standards there have been increases in wages and earning capacity and earning power among the people in this province. Coupled with that there has also been an ability created on the part of individuals to pay a greater proportion of the amount of tax on a municipal basis.

The same ratio as between burden of responsibility for payments and obliga-

tions in relation to the earning capacity of individuals is approximate, but we are climbing up what I choose to call sometimes a graduated scale or stairway. The duties climb with the revenues, and we are one step farther along than we were last year. We question whether we are any better off economically save and except that we have already achieved a superior standard of living than we had in the past.

I am sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not in his place at the moment, because I wanted to say something in regard to a matter which he raised a few days ago, and that is relative to the Municipal Advisory Committee, to which he referred. He also referred to the Provincial Municipal Relations Committee which was established in 1951, by the hon. Prime Minister. He made a remark, if my memory serves me correctly, to the effect that there had only been one small "squib of a report" made by that committee, that they had "come up" with two observations only; namely, that the committee had said that we had reached the peak of our tax ability and unconditional grants.

Now, the situation is this:

Last year the hon. leader of the Opposition indicated that he had not seen a copy of the Provincial Municipal Relations Committee report and I took the opportunity of seeing that he was furnished with a copy immediately when he made that request known. I do not have a copy of that report in front of me at the moment, but I can say to the hon. members of this House that the progress report as furnished by that committee was a voluminous statistical data report and it contained a number of recommendations, some of which were implemented by this government.

In that regard I refer particularly to the matter of unconditional grants, to which I have already referred, and to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred a few days ago. There was also a reference to the suggestion of a creation of regional areas in order to diffuse the tax burden on given areas, so that

one municipality which had a considerable amount of industry would not benefit at the expense of another municipality which did not have very much industry.

That is more or less the same basis that we have in our Toronto Metropolitan area. Of the 13 municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan area there are one or two municipalities which have little or no industry, but with a very high percentage of residential assessment. Some other municipalities have a very high industrial assessment and do not have a very large residential assessment.

Out of this whole Metropolitan scheme has developed a greater benefit to some of those municipalities which otherwise would not have benefited from the industrial and commercial assessment. They can now benefit from that on a metropolitan or regional basis whereas otherwise they were not able to receive any particular benefit from that assessment at all.

In connection with the Municipal Advisory Committee may I say that this was a committee which was appointed by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs in November, 1955. The personnel of the Provincial Municipal Relations Committee I referred to last year. Its personnel included elected representatives, in the main, together with certain representatives of governmental departments. The Municipal Advisory Committee consists of 7 persons: Mr. Grant Crawford who comes from Kingston and who has had a great deal of experience in municipal affairs in connection with Queen's University; Mr. W. H. Heaton, Clerk-Treasurer of the Township of East York in the Toronto Metropolitan area; Mr. Eric Hardy, who is associated with one of the well-known municipal organizations, the Municipal Research Bureau in Toronto; Mr. J. W. McBain, Clerk-Treasurer of Teck Township in northern Ontario; Mr. William G. Manning—

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): A very good man, too.

MR. BRANDON: —County Clerk of the County of Ontario, not too far removed from Toronto; Mr. E. C. Reid, Clerk-Treasurer of the City of St. Thomas; and I have the privilege of serving as chairman of that committee.

Every one of the persons on this committee has had considerable experience on municipal affairs. The other day the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested that, inasmuch as this was a government committee, it would probably be a "rubber stamp committee," and would bring in whatever was asked of it by the government.

In reply I will read to you a part of the agenda of this committee for its December meeting which consisted of 3 days, of its January meeting which consisted of 3 days, and of the February meeting which convened today, to give an idea of some of the considerations this committee is giving to municipal affairs.

The first items to which I want to refer dealing with the matter of the December agenda are the "Educational cost survey of the Ontario School Trustees Council"; "memorandum by the Direct Sellers Group (Ontario)"; "the Canadian Manufacturers Association Inc."; "a proposal submitted to the Ontario Provincial-Municipal Relations Committee."

"Hawkers and Peddlers, Municipal Act, Section 410."

"Delegation to attend the committee on December 15."

Mr. J. T. Crowder, *et al*, representing the Canadian Wholesale Hardware Association.

"Building restrictions and regulations, Municipal Act, section 388(1), paragraph 7, *et seq.*"

"National Building Code, and its administration."

"Trailers and Trailer Camps."

"The Municipal Act; obtain files from The Department of Municipal Affairs."

"Contact with municipal associations and other groups."

"1954 progress report of the Provincial-Municipal Relations Committee."



"Reserves and reserve funds."

"Assessments; Assessment Act; uniform assessments; equalization; submission of the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves, the Ontario Municipal Board."

"Boundaries and status of municipalities."

"Structure of local governments."

That is just one agenda, Mr. Speaker.

May I say to the hon. members of the House that at the conclusion of each meeting of the committee, there is forwarded to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs a report of the considerations and deliberations of the committee at each sitting; in other words, there has been a report given to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs in December, January, and another the end of this week.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question, and it is for information only.

How does the committee decide what it is going to do? What has been referred to it for examination? Is the committee empowered to review The Municipal Act and The Assessment Act?

HON. MR. FROST: Surely, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes, that is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: What is the authority given to this committee? Someone should inform the hon. members.

MR. BRANDON: I think perhaps I can answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I should be delighted to listen for a while.

MR. BRANDON: Mr. Speaker, the committee has had referred to it from time to time various delegations which have called on the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, concerning some of the problems to which I referred earlier, such as the matter of the business assessments.

We have also had delegations dealing with the matter of hawkers and peddlers. One was in attendance there this morning.

We have also had the problem of dealing with certain matters referred by the hon. Minister. Offhand, one of which I can think of at the moment is concerning recommendations by way of proposed amendments to The Voters' List Act.

Problems which have been referred to the department by various municipal clerks, asking for some uniformity of practice to be set up in the form of ballots, and other matters pertaining to it. This matter was dealt with last month, and there was a report made to the hon. Minister, in part.

Following that, there was a request circulated from the secretary of the committee to the municipal clerks asking them to refer any particular problems they desired to the committee.

This is aside from matters which the hon. Minister may refer to the committee. And when I say the hon. Minister refers the problem to the committee," the hon. Minister does not refer the problem and the answer but refers the problem, and the committee comes up with the answer, and that answer is submitted in the form of a written report.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, are these problems the hon. Minister has heretofore answered, but which he now finds he would rather refer to the committee?

MR. BRANDON: They have not been answered at all.

MR. OLIVER: They have been dealt with from time to time?

MR. BRANDON: They are problems which are coming in constantly.

MR. OLIVER: New problems?

MR. BRANDON: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: The old ones are all cleaned up?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh yes, everything is fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRANDON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition would be a wizard indeed, if he were able to clean them all up.

As far as the committee is concerned, it is dealing with current municipal problems, as well as the matters to which I referred earlier this afternoon, that is, the matter of the Assessment, Municipal, and the Municipal Board Acts, and others. The committee has full and complete authority to deal with those matters, or any matter concerned with municipalities, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader of the Opposition has any municipal problem he would like to have dealt with, send it along to our secretary, and the committee will see what it can do about it.

MR. OLIVER: If they become unduly pressing, I will consider doing that.

MR. BRANDON: Then I have here, Mr. Speaker, the agenda of the committee for February. This agenda is prepared by the secretary of the committee. The following are on the agenda for the committee meetings today, tomorrow and Friday:

"Delegations, Periodical Press Association, Section 410 of The Municipal Act, dealing with hawkers and peddlers, and assessment exemptions."

Can any hon. member tell me of any more pressing matter than assessment exemptions? Periodically, there are private Bills brought before the Committee on Private Bills of this House, when exemption on real estate, by way of a private Bill, is requested, and at the same time we have municipalities asking for increased funds. As all hon. members know, of course, where we have exemptions, there are no tax revenues accruing from that particular quarter.

"The assessment on bowling alleys; the biennial Metropolitan Toronto overall elected council; set dates for municipal elections, and standards governing

municipal elections, regional sittings," and so on.

All I wish to say to the hon. members of the House is this, in connection with that committee: as I have said before, the committee is composed of personnel experienced in municipal affairs, and they have been given a free hand by the hon. Minister to deal with that particular subject.

If I may pass on from that matter of municipal affairs, into another adjacent phase, which has a bearing upon municipalities—

MR. OLIVER: Before the hon. member proceeds with that, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this committee, when it has arrived at a conclusion, sends it to the department in the form of a recommendation?

MR. BRANDON: That is right.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: That is correct, yes.

MR. OLIVER: The committee recommends its findings as made to the department?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It is an advisory committee.

MR. BRANDON: The advisory committee submits a report which consists of the recommendations on various matters it has considered, and the report compiles the recommendations made to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. OLIVER: We will see how that works out.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned the assessment of bowling alleys: may I enquire what discussion there would be about bowling alleys?

MR. BRANDON: For the enlightenment of the hon. member for Bruce, may I say he, not being a lawyer, may not be aware of this problem.

MR. OLIVER: And he has no bowling alleys up there either.

MR. BRANDON: There is an association of bowling alley proprietors who claim to be exempt for business assessment purposes, by reason of the fact that they are bowling alley operators only. There has been a case in a municipality where bowling alley equipment was assessed for business assessment purposes, and the bowling alley proprietor appealed the assessment on the ground that it is not a proper business assessment any more than if you had a desk in your office, that desk should not be assessed for business purposes. The realty is assessed, that is, the realty in which the bowling alley is situate, but the bowling alley itself is not a part of the realty. It is in the same category as an office desk or an office chair.

Secondly, the suggestion is the alley should not be assessed for business assessment purposes. That is a matter which we have under consideration before a legal tribunal already, and there have been representations made by the solicitor representing this group to this committee, and a brief has already been filed, seeking the advice and recommendation of the committee as to what should be done in relation to the assessment of bowling alleys.

MR. OLIVER: The committee cannot do a thing while this matter is before the courts.

MR. BRANDON: Not until it is finalized by the courts, no.

MR. WHICHER: Has the hon. member advised them on that score?

MR. BRANDON: It is on the agenda. The first meeting of the committee was held today. I was not able to be at the meeting all day, but I was there for a portion of the meeting this morning.

MR. WHICHER: I would be interested in knowing what advice was given, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRANDON: If I may pass on to the matter of planning. Up until 1946, in the Province of Ontario, it was left pretty much to the local municipi-

palities to provide and take care of zoning within their borders. In 1946, The Planning Act was passed, whereby additional facilities were made available to municipalities to set up a recognized and organized scheme of land development within their borders, and also in the municipality relating to fringe areas.

Many municipalities have taken advantage of that; some, of course, have not. It is the old story of a person erecting a very expensive property, costing, say, \$20,000 or \$30,000, and have someone come along and erect a shack next door costing perhaps only \$1,000. The hon. members can readily appreciate that the effect on the more expensive property would be very real, insofar as having a property of much lesser value established immediately adjacent thereto.

So we have had set up, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, zoning by-laws. Many municipalities have taken advantage of the creation of areas for commercial, industrial and residential developments of certain types, and it has worked out very well.

Then, of course, associated with that, there has also been in some municipalities, rural in nature to begin with, situations where provincial highways have developed, particularly the non-access highways, where there have been original sales made for, say, \$500 per acre, but where the ultimate sale price was many times that figure, as a result of the non-access highway, and also by reason of the zoning by-laws which had been approved and developed at the municipal level.

By and large, as I say, there has been, as a result of the development of planning and zoning under this Act, a considerable and substantial increase in the benefits to the municipalities concerned.

I would like at this time to say something pertinent to the Department of Health. One problem which I believe has confronted elected representatives in practically every municipality at one time or another has been that of mentally-retarded children. As a result,



there have been many requests made to the elected representatives to have provision made for the hospitalization and care of these children, especially in cases where they have proven to have caused considerable strain upon the mother or father or the home life in the home in which such a child has been living.

A few years ago I remember being in Kirkland Lake and visiting a class of mentally retarded children which was conducted by two women associated with a church. They put on a demonstration for a group there, and it was really surprising to see the manner in which these children were able to conduct themselves, and indeed to enjoy life. They exemplified the fact that they were able to accomplish something of a very practical nature.

In the Department of Health there has been developed a hospital at Orillia, as we know, and in recent years there has been developed a further hospital at Smiths Falls. In the hospital at Orillia there is accommodation for, and there are being accommodated at the present time, approximately 2,400 of these mentally retarded children, about 300 of whom are under 6 years of age. Will the hon. members stop and think of that, 300 of these children under 6 years of age, at that one hospital. At Smiths Falls we have similar accommodation for approximately 2,400, and there again we have 300 to 400 under 6 years of age and about 1,600 under 16 years of age.

This is a terrific problem, Mr. Speaker, especially to the home life of those of us who are more directly concerned with these unfortunate "kiddies". We will all recall, for example, a matter of a month or so ago that the Civitan Clubs across this country took up the torch for the mentally retarded children and sponsored a drive for campaign funds for this organization, which campaign incidentally proved to be a great success and provided funds which will improve and establish many beneficial projects for those children.

From a government standpoint I suppose that, as our population increases,

the possibility of mentally retarded children being born into various homes being problematical would also necessitate provision being made in greater quantum in the future for unfortunate children of this type.

But all I say is this at the moment, that while the hon. Prime Minister has prepared and is preparing for additional accommodation for those unfortunate children, you and I and those of us who have not had to deal with this particular problem on a personal basis should feel very happy and very glad that the problem has not been placed on our doorstep and, at the same time, be prepared to do whatever we can to help those who have this particular burden at hand.

I want to congratulate the hon. Attorney-General on his recent appointment, and to say to him how pleased we all are at the great success which his Safety Campaign has achieved in the last two or three months. We know for example that there was a great deal of publicity in the newspapers concerning the radar equipment which was being used on the Queen Elizabeth Way, and on the Barrie Highway, much to the consternation of some motorists who chose to drive along those highways at 80 and 90 miles an hour.

At the same time, no one can deny the fact that the pressure of the safety organization of his department, which was exemplified through the Ontario Provincial Police Force, through its officers and staff, had much to do with the curtailment of accidents during that time and even up to the present time as it is being presently followed out.

In November and December of 1954 and January of 1955 there were 6,984 accidents according to the Ontario Provincial Police authorities. In the corresponding 3 months, that is November and December of 1955 and January of 1956, there were 6,831, a decrease of 153 or a decrease percentage-wise of 2.2 per cent.

Fatal accidents over the same respective periods, 1954-55, 186, and in 1955-56, 145, representing a decrease of 22 per cent. Now, that is very important,

a decrease of 22 per cent. during that 3 months' period.

The hon. Attorney-General, in addition to that, advised me this afternoon that during the month of January just past—as compared with January of 1955—there was a decrease of approximately 40 per cent., so that hon. members can see that the Safety Drive Campaign which the hon. Attorney-General has launched, and is carrying on, has proven to be very successful and very practical.

The other day we read in our newspapers of a very unfortunate accident on the Queen Elizabeth Way just west of Toronto, where a driver got into the wrong lane, went speeding on his way and became involved in a head-on collision wherein not only was he killed, but an innocent driver, driving on his own side of the highway, as a law-abiding citizen, came to his death also.

The question is, what can one do about a case like that? You can never legislate against the human error or the human intent of a person who is unmindful or reckless as to the circumstance in which he may find himself. You can legislate, you can tell the people what to do. You can do your very best to see that every one lives a useful and a happy existence, but there are certain circumstances, as I say, which you cannot legislate against. The only thing you can do in a case like that, if the individual happens to survive and not die in such a crash, is to make an example of his error in judgment, and of his misconduct so far as society is concerned.

One of the best things that ever happened in the Province of Ontario was the suspension of licences of drivers who became involved in motor accidents. I have had cases—and I am sure so have other lawyers in this House—where if it had not been for the suspension of the licence of the driver, he would have forgotten all about the accident or the payment of damages. But, because he comes to court and says, "Mr. Magistrate, I am a chauffeur, I am a truck driver, I have got to have my licence or I cannot work," he puts a premium value on that driver's licence of his and,

as I say, it is a real incentive in the decrease of accidents and in motor safety to stiffen the penalties and increase the suspension of licences, because that is one of the great methods, in my opinion, whereby we would be able to rid the highways of irresponsible drivers.

The other day I had the opportunity of receiving from the hon. Attorney-General a copy of a report which he made to the McRuer Commission dealing with the matter of sex deviates. I have read that report and I am sure that the hon. Attorney-General and his staff are to be commended upon the submissions contained in it. There are many practical suggestions and recommendations to which I am sure the McRuer Commission will pay attention when the time comes for them to make their report.

Now, there is one matter which to me, as a lawyer, presents a problem which I think I should mention to hon. members, and that is in connection with sex offences against children. It has long been the law of this province—and indeed of Canada in our Criminal Code—that where a person is charged with certain sex offence, there needs must be corroboration.

You are faced with this matter of circumstances and of fact. Where the offences occur, invariably you find that there are only two people there, the child and the accused person, and corroboration is not the easiest thing in the world to obtain. Consequently it is not the easiest thing, in all of these cases, to adduce sufficient evidence to obtain a conviction in cases where one may be almost certain that a conviction should be registered.

To that end I "go along" with the recommendation of the hon. Attorney-General in his report, that in some cases where the magistrate or the judge, in his discretion, might decide that, in the light of the surrounding circumstances, corroboration might be dispensed with, it might, in fact, be so dispensed with.

Immediately some hon. members may say: "Well, what about a child, maybe 6 or 7 years of age, who may not be

truthful, or one who may wish to exaggerate the facts? What about one who may want to involve some man in a crime of this sort, one who may not be too responsible when it comes to telling the truth?"

As I say, that is something over which none of us has any control. But if the presiding judge or magistrate, in the light of all the circumstances, were to satisfy himself, if it were possible from what evidence which may be available, that the corroboration presently required might be dispensed with, in fairness to the accused, then I say that that procedure should be adopted.

While I am dealing with the matter of sex offenders may I say that on Monday of this week I attended a Service Club luncheon, and at that meeting we were addressed by an officer of a municipality who had charge of traffic enforcement. This officer gave us statistics in the Metropolitan Toronto area of the number of children who had been fatally injured during the last 10 years, and he made this statement:

During the last 10 years in the Toronto Metropolitan area there had been approximately 500 children fatally injured as a result of motor accidents.

In the same period of time there had been 3 cases of fatalities in regard to sex offenders in southern Ontario, and people became very much alarmed in regard to the latter, but in regard to the former loss of life, it seemed to be taken more or less as an everyday occurrence. There did not seem to be the same feeling, the same upsurge of thought and mind of the public in regard to the motor fatalities as there was in regard to the matter of sexual offences.

The reason for that is, I submit, that that type of offence is not prevalent, and we certainly hope it does not become prevalent.

One other department that I would like to say a word about is that of Reform Institutions. The other day we had certain observations made by the hon. member for York South (Mr.

MacDonald) concerning The Department of Reform Institutions, dealing with some of the inmates at Galt, and the treatment which one inmate in particular had received. The one expression of thought which seemed to be predominant, as I recall the discussion which occurred, was that a girl had been put into confinement for 92 days, I believe it was, and I remember that figure "92 days" being mentioned more than once.

In that connection we must consider two or three things; in the first place, how does it come about that these boys find their way into the school at Bowmanville and the girls into the school at Galt?

We generally find they are the product of broken homes where discipline has been lacking, where they have not received the benefit of good home training or care. They have been left pretty much "on their own" and ultimately they find themselves in an environment of associates which proves undesirable.

Then they find their way into the juvenile court, and from the juvenile court into an institution such as that to which I have referred. We also find that where there has been a lack of discipline, it is quite conceivable that a great resentment is built up on the part of such a child when discipline is applied.

We recall that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) in dealing with this same case, referred to the fact that this girl had, or was purported to have, attacked one of the staff with scissors. Can any one imagine anything more critical than a child with scissors in such circumstances, and the child not being reprimanded? You know, some people you can reprimand with a slapping, some people you can reprimand with a talking to, and other people you have to reprimand in another way. My submission in that particular case—and indeed in a number of cases—is that the matter of discipline at all times in all of the institutions is paramount.



What would happen, for instance, in some of our penitentiaries if discipline were not enforced, where you are dealing with older people, with more cunning minds in regard to criminal matters? We have had instances occur from time to time in some of our federal and provincial institutions as a result of "ganging up," so to speak, of the inmates on staff, resulting in loss of property and so forth. Those people have to be disciplined. If they do not fit into our society of ordinary public life which has been created by our laws and our Statutes, then they have to be prepared to take the consequences, and pay the penalty of not fitting into the society in which you and I live.

Consequently, relative to this particular incident I wish to say that the creation and the retaining of discipline at all times is of great moment and great necessity with such inmates.

The other week I had the opportunity of being present at the Mimico Reformatory at the official opening of the Drug Addicts' Clinic. The clinic was officially opened by the Honourable, the Chief Justice of Ontario, together with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

It was a revelation to me to see the facilities which are available to the unfortunate people suffering from this particular affliction at this particular clinic. Accommodation is provided there for some 25 people, and we were told at that time that in the main it was the product of the effort and the materials from other properties operated by the Reform Institutions of this province and by inmates residing at those other institutions. Any of the hon. members of this House who have not as yet been out to see that clinic should go. It is certainly worth while seeing for yourself what The Department of Reform Institutions has done and is doing for persons afflicted with narcotic addiction.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say how pleasant it has been for me to

be a supporter of the government headed by the hon. Prime Minister and also to be associated with the various forms of practical endeavour in the various departments of government. This all leads up to one thing, the providing of legislation for the human betterment of the people of this province.

Finally I want to read from a Press clipping which I received the other day, which I think is very apt and it is more apt this week than it was last, because in the last few days we have celebrated the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. The caption is "Abraham Lincoln," and it reads:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wagepayer.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Mr. R. M. Myers (Waterloo South) moves the adjournment of the debate.  
Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 of the clock p.m.











# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, February 16, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, February 16, 1956

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Final report Standing Committee on Standing Orders, Mr. Hunt .....</b>                  | <b>279</b> |
| <b>First report Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....</b>                 | <b>280</b> |
| <b>All-Canada Pipe Line Act, Bill respecting, Mr. Porter, first reading .....</b>          | <b>281</b> |
| <b>Regulations Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....</b>                    | <b>281</b> |
| <b>Trustee Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....</b>                        | <b>281</b> |
| <b>Securities Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....</b>                     | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Town of Chelmsford, Bill respecting, Mr. Belisle, first reading .....</b>               | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Gairdner Charitable Foundation, Bill to incorporate, Mr. Macaulay, first reading ..</b> | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Parkland Improvement Foundation, Bill to incorporate, Mr. Macaulay, first reading</b>   | <b>282</b> |
| <b>City of Port Arthur, Bill respecting, Mr. Macaulay, first reading .....</b>             | <b>282</b> |
| <b>City of Sault Ste. Marie, Bill respecting, Mr. Macaulay, first reading .....</b>        | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Metropolitan Toronto Foundation, Bill to incorporate, Mr. Grossman, first reading</b>   | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Town of Fort Erie, Bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, first reading .....</b>                 | <b>282</b> |
| <b>City of Niagara Falls, Bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, first reading .....</b>             | <b>282</b> |
| <b>Township of Stamford, Bill respecting, Mr. Jolley, first reading .....</b>              | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Town of Brampton, Bill respecting, Mr. Yaremko, first reading .....</b>                 | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa, Bill respecting,</b>                  |            |
| Mr. Lavergne, first reading .....  | 283        |
| <b>Town of Leaside, Bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, first reading .....</b>                  | <b>283</b> |
| <b>County of Renfrew, Bill respecting, Mr. Maloney, first reading .....</b>                | <b>283</b> |
| <b>City of London, Bill respecting, Mr. Robarts, first reading .....</b>                   | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Presbyterian Church in Canada, Synod of Toronto and Kingston,</b>                       |            |
| Bill respecting, Mr. Letherby, first reading .....   | 283        |
| <b>Town of Timmins, Bill respecting, Mr. Spooner, first reading .....</b>                  | <b>283</b> |
| <b>City of Hamilton, Bill respecting, Mr. Connell, first reading .....</b>                 | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Town of Chelmsford, Bill respecting, Mr. Belisle, first reading .....</b>               | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Township of North York, Bill respecting, Mr. Graham, first reading .....</b>            | <b>283</b> |
| <b>United Co-operatives of Ontario, Bill respecting, Mr. Oliver, first reading .....</b>   | <b>283</b> |
| <b>Ottawa Community Chests, Bill respecting, Mr. Herbert, first reading .....</b>          | <b>284</b> |
| <b>City of Ottawa, Bill respecting, Mr. Herbert, first reading .....</b>                   | <b>284</b> |
| <b>City of Toronto, Bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading .....</b>                  | <b>284</b> |
| <b>Village of Richmond Hill, Bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading .....</b>       | <b>284</b> |
| <b>Assumption College, Bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, first reading .....</b>               | <b>284</b> |
| <b>City of Stratford, Bill respecting, Mr. Edwards, first reading .....</b>                | <b>284</b> |
| <b>City of Windsor, Bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, first reading .....</b>                  | <b>284</b> |
| <b>Resumption of Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Myers, Mr. Kelly ....</b>       | <b>285</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....</b>                               | <b>305</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....</b>                                       | <b>305</b> |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. S. J. Hunt, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented the committee's second and final report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Leaside praying that an Act may pass repealing The Town of Leaside Act, 1939.

Petition of the Corporation of The Township of North York praying that an Act may pass authorizing the council to pass by-laws requiring the maintenance of adequate and suitable heat of rented or leased dwellings.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Timmins praying that an Act may pass authorizing a municipal bus transportation system.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement between the corporation and the corporations of adjacent municipalities providing for funds to be raised by debenture issues for the erection of the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of London praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement conveying the assets of the London and Port Stanley Railway Company to the City of London; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of Ottawa Community Chests praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands, etc., of the corporation from taxation.

Petition of the Corporation of United Co-operatives of Ontario praying that an Act may pass increasing the authorized capital of the corporation.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Stratford praying that an Act may pass authorizing the corporation to grant \$30,000 to the Stratford Festival Foundation from the sinking fund surplus; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement between the corporation and the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority respecting assessment, taxation and other matters relating to "Peace Bridge."

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass amending The City of Ottawa Act, 1952; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Stamford praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement for the erection of a swimming pool and ancillary buildings on lands granted to the corporation for park purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass authorizing pensions for employees and their families,

Petition of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston of The Presbyterian Church in Canada praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands comprising Glen Mhro Camp from taxation.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Toronto praying that an Act may pass authorizing an increase in the corporation's annual grant to the Toronto Convention and Tourists' Association; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement for the sale of a parcel of land to the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation.

Petition praying that an Act may pass incorporating Parkland Improvement Foundation.

Petition praying that an Act may pass incorporating Gairdner Charitable Foundation.

Petition of the Corporation of the Village of Richmond Hill praying that an Act may pass dissolving an injunction restraining the corporation from discharging effluent into a branch of the Don River; and for related purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Brampton praying that an Act may pass authorizing municipal parking lots, one-half the capital and maintenance costs of which shall be levied against occupants of lands in a defined area; and for related purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Chelmsford praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for the purpose of constructing a public school.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Chelmsford praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for the construction of watermains.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing the installation of back-water valves in private drain connections at the request and expense of the owners of improved properties; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing the corporation to make grants to institutions, associations, etc; and for other purposes.

Petition praying that an Act may pass incorporating The Metropolitan Toronto Foundation.

Petition of the Corporation of Assumption College praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the college to Assumption University of Windsor; and for related purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the County of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for road construction.

Mr. J. Yaremko, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the committee's first report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Sarnia General Hospital.

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America.

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill No. 10, An Act respecting Canadian Pacific Railway.

Bill No. 19, An Act respecting the Board of Education for the City of Hamilton.

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Protestant Home of St. Catharines.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Sarnia General Hospital, Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America and on Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Protestant Home of St. Catharines.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) J. YAREMKO  
Chairman

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### ALL-CANADA PIPE LINE ACT

Hon. D. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to Facilitate the Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by Means of an All-Canada Pipe Line."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on second reading of this Bill, I propose to give at some length the background and events leading up to its introduction and the reasons for the government putting this Bill forward. The Bill itself being a very brief document, I will read it.

*Whereas* the transportation of natural gas from Alberta to central Canada is a vital necessity to supplement the energy resources available for the continued industrial growth of Ontario; and whereas the carriage of such gas through a pipe line situated entirely within the jurisdiction of Canada and running through northern Ontario is in the public interest of Ontario;

Therefore, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

1. For the purpose of implementing the arrangements made or to be made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario to facilitate the construction of a connecting link through northern Ontario of a pipe line to transport natural gas from Alberta into central Ontario, the Treasurer of Ontario is hereby authorized to loan from time to time out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund any sum of money, but not more than \$35 million, to a corporation constituted or to be constituted on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada and having as a purpose the construction aforesaid.

2. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent.

3. This Act may be cited as The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act, 1956.

MR. OLIVER: Is there any interest rate stipulated, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I propose to table the correspondence passing between the two governments in regard to this matter. The arrangement as to interest rates will be settled at the prevailing rates, at the time the money is to be provided.

HON. MR. FROST: As in the Co-operative Loans Act.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is another example of co-operation.

### THE REGULATIONS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Regulations Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for exempting from The Regulations Act orders-in-council designating secondary roads and county roads. This is extending the exemptions now applicable to the King's highway.

### THE TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Trustee Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to protect an administrator *ad litem* in his personal capacity from the effects of a judgment against him in his representative capacity.

Subsection 2a came into force on April 5, 1951. The re-enactment is made effective on the same date in order to give the desired effect in all cases.



## THE SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Securities Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill, I would like to say there are a number of procedural amendments, chiefly under two headings; first, in relation to the provision in the Act which exempts certain securities from registration.

One of the exemptions is where an offering is made to shareholders of a company. It was found that in the case of certain persons certain defunct companies with large numbers of shareholders could, under certain circumstances, obtain the control, and persons would then seek to make use of these large lists—which might number 1,000 or 2,000 or more—to offer the securities of the company to the shareholders without registration, and without filing under The Securities Act.

This amendment now makes it impossible to do that, if the Securities Commission feels that registration should take place.

The other main heading is to bring the auditing provision under The Securities Act, with respect to registration, in line with the auditing provisions under The Corporations Act, which was enacted a year or two ago.

## THE TOWN OF CHELMSFORD

Mr. R. Belisle moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Town of Chelmsford."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## GAIRDNER CHARITABLE FOUNDATION

Mr. R. Macaulay moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate Gairdner Charitable Foundation."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## PARKLAND IMPROVEMENT FOUNDATION

Mr. Macaulay moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Parkland Improvement Foundation."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

Mr. Macaulay, in the absence of Mr. Wardrope, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. Macaulay, in the absence of Mr. Lyons, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO FOUNDATION

Mr. A. Grossman moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Toronto Foundation."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWN OF FORT ERIE

Mr. A. Jolley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. Jolley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWNSHIP OF STAMFORD

Mr. Jolley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of Stamford."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWN OF BRAMPTON

Mr. J. Yaremko, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Brampton."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE BEECHWOOD CEMETERY  
COMPANY OF THE  
CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. G. F. Lavergne moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWN OF LEASIDE

Mr. H. Beckett moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Leaside."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE COUNTY OF RENFREW

Mr. J. Maloney moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the County of Renfrew."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. P. Robarts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
IN CANADA, SYNOD OF  
TORONTO AND KINGSTON

Mr. L. Letherby moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Presbyterian Church in Canada, Synod of Toronto and Kingston."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWN OF TIMMINS

Mr. J. W. Spooner moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Timmins."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. R. Connell moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE TOWN OF CHELMSFORD

Mr. R. Belisle moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Chelmsford."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF  
NORTH YORK

Mr. T. Graham moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of North York."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE UNITED CO-OPERATIVES  
OF ONTARIO

Mr. F. R. Oliver moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the United Co-operatives of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE OTTAWA COMMUNITY CHESTS

Mr. A. Herbert in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Ottawa Community Chests."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Herbert, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE VILLAGE OF RICHMOND HILL

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Village of Richmond Hill."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### ASSUMPTION COLLEGE

Mr. W. Murdoch moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Assumption College."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE CITY OF STRATFORD

Mr. J. F. Edwards moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Stratford."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

### THE CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. Murdoch in the absence of Mr. Davies, moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day I desire to table a copy of the submission by the Province of Ontario to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. I am arranging, Mr. Speaker, to have this distributed to all hon. members. I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition—

MR. OLIVER: Particularly?

HON. MR. FROST: —and other persons to note that the cost of this is \$2 per copy, but the distribution will be made free.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Prime Minister sure he has everything in there?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that, in the main, the great prospects and aspirations of this province are pretty well covered.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to table the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of the questions relating to The Farm Products Marketing Act referred to yesterday. This submission, of course is tabled in the name of the Solicitor for the Attorney-General of Canada. This legislation is being submitted by the hon. Attorney-General for Canada at the request of the Province of Ontario, after due consultation with the other provincial governments of Canada.

I have one copy for the hon. leader of the Opposition and one for the hon. member for York South.

Tomorrow the hon. provincial Treasurer will table certain matters relating to the Bill just introduced, entitled The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act, 1956. The documents to be tabled have already



been printed and made public, and I think are pretty widely known.

The documents to be tabled tomorrow will include, first, the relevant correspondence, particularly the letters from the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe to the hon. Treasurer under the date of November 25 last, and the reply by the hon. Treasurer on the succeeding day, November 26.

Secondly, they will include the agreement which was sent to us between Canada—that is the Government of Canada—and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company, and thirdly, the report obtained by the Government of Ontario from Mr. Grant Glassco, known as the "Glassco Report", relative to certain matters of interest and importance in relation to this project.

Those documents will be tabled tomorrow and I think the hon. Treasurer can arrange to have copies made available for the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that copies of the correspondence and the Glassco Report will be available at the beginning of next week for all hon. members, and will be distributed to them at that time. In the meantime, those who are interested in the subject, of course, can review the documents as tabled.

We intend, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with second reading of this Bill on Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: We have in the House this afternoon 4 groups of students from widely separated communities. We have a group of students from Ridgeway Public School in the village of Ridgeway; a group from Forest Hill Village Junior High School; a group from Earl Beatty Public School in Toronto; and in the West Gallery, we have a group representing two schools on Christian Island. This group had to cross the ice for a distance of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  miles this morning on foot to get here, and then travel over 100 miles from Penetang to the Buildings.

We welcome this group from Christian Island, particularly the chief, who is with the students as well as the students from other places in Ontario.

Orders of the day.

## THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, may I begin by following the very pleasant custom, which has grown up over the years, of extending my congratulations to you, upon your accession to your present high office. I am not going to stop with that, however, because I am going to ask if you realize how very much more pleasant the position is in Canada than it formerly was in England. I have just been reading a history of Speakers in the English Parliament and I noticed that years ago with a change of government the Speaker often lost his head.

The history was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, and it mentioned that the gentleman who was holding the office in the time of the execution of Charles I had to put the question as to whether the king should be executed to the House, and he did not know what to do. He burst into tears and sobbed: "Gentlemen, I am no less a servant of the King than I am of the House, and I do not know what to do. It is not that I will not put the question, but that I dare not."

Now, let me say that over the years the Speakers have developed much greater tact and judgment, and in these days, nothing untoward has happened to them at all. And you, sir, one of the most recent appointees, by the very nature of evolution, are perhaps endowed to the utmost with all those qualities which go to make up a good Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am in the mood for making comments let me pay tribute to the hon. leader of the CCF Party for the very excellent composition of an article which appeared in the Press throughout the province on January 7. In this article he described a

part-Indian girl, a very delinquent girl who came from the north, in these words: "She is a high spirited, undisciplined child of the forest." Let me say, in the heart of the leader of the CCF Party is a great deal of poetry and may I say also that he has a very good imagination.

While still on the subject of "paying tribute," may I pay one to the hon. Attorney-General. Just a few days ago I was driving out of Hamilton in one of those areas which has a speed limit of 30 miles an hour and then suddenly a 50-mile-an-hour area is reached. I was not thinking of the road particularly, but rather thinking of the speech which the leader of the CCF Party had recently made.

In that speech he advocated that The Department of Reform Institutions supply their training schools with numbers of trained psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers, so that each inmate could have individual counselling and advice. He assured us that the only way anyone can effect reform is by the services of these individuals, very difficult services, I presume, to provide. As I was thinking of that subject, I went past one of the signs which The Department of Highways has placed along the highway.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Not the red light, surely?

MR. MYERS: No. The sign said: "Drive carefully, the life you save may be your own." Then I passed another sign which read: "Drive slowly, hurry kills." And I wondered if those signs ever caused anybody to drive more carefully. Then I thought, surely it would be better if some compulsion were used to make people drive more carefully. Just at that minute, Mr. Speaker—and this is a fact—a police officer came out from behind a parked car and signalled me to the roadside and he said: "I have clocked you at 40 miles an hour. Let me see your licence." That appears to me to be a good comparison between the method by which some form of compulsion is used and the method of

dispensing good advice which latter method the hon. member for York South advocates in the operation of reform schools.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member for Waterloo South wants to watch out or he will be in a reform institution himself and find out what really happens there.

MR. MYERS: Is it better to tell our reformatory inmates to be better boys and girls, or to attempt to mould their character by a system of rewards and penalties? Or perhaps a combination of the two is best? That would perhaps be the way to run the reform institutions. Get the inmates going along at a proper speed by imposition of penalties for failure and then by some warning, perhaps, or by some exhortation, ensure they maintain safe modes of travelling through life.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo South did not tell us about the speeding charge.

MR. MYERS: The officer assured me that I would get a ticket within the next day or two, and let me say that I congratulated the officer upon the job he was doing.

The leader of the CCF Party expressed great horror because The Department of Reform Institutions is administering strapping to some inmates of schools and reformatories. He spoke with a great deal of positiveness, but he did admit that there are divisions, even in political Parties, on the subject of "strapping" and I thought perhaps it might be interesting to find out just what Party he is talking about which has within it divisions of opinion about strapping.

All hon. members who were present at the last session were well acquainted with the House leader of the CCF Party, "Bill" Grummett. I have known him for 30 or 35 years and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that he was very well regarded by everyone who knew him. He was in this House for 12 years; he was a lawyer for 30 or 35 years, and a coroner

for at least 30 years, and, more than that, he was a kindly man.

Mr. Grummett was a member of the select committee of this House which conducted an investigation into reform institutions and, during the course of those investigations Mr. Grummett, as a member of that committee, visited more than 150 reform institutions, not only in Ontario but in the Province of Quebec and in the State of New York. One would expect, then, that Mr. Grummett would know something about any matter pertaining to reform, and I should like to read a Press report which appeared in all the newspapers about December 1, 1953, dealing with the subject of "strapping." It is headed:

WOODSHED NEAR COURT URGED FOR  
YOUNG OFFENDER

"I think we should go back to a new type of woodshed attached to the courts," W. J. Grummett, CCF House leader told the Legislature's Select Committee on Reform Institutions yesterday, as it heard testimony on the problem of handling juvenile offenders.

Mr. Grummett said: "When these boys get out of jail and return to the gang, they tell tall stories of how they acted in jail. There wouldn't be any talking done if they were given a good strapping."

That report appeared in a number of newspapers and was commented on in almost every daily Press. Let me read an editorial which appeared in the *Brantford Expositor*, which is typical of them all:

The Ontario Legislature's Select Committee on Reform Institutions has been given a useful opinion by Mr. W. J. Grummett, the CCF House leader. It is that a woodshed attached to courts would help solve the juvenile delinquency problem.

The "woodshed" for obvious purposes would eliminate the glory that seems to enshroud youths who have spent time in jail, Mr. Grummett thinks. When these boys get out of jail, he told the committee, they re-

turn to their gangs and tell tall stories of how they acted in jail. There wouldn't be any talking if they were given good strappings.

We agree with the CCF House leader (which is something we do not always do). More important by way of expert support, so does Dr. G. E. Reaman, now of the Ontario Agricultural College, and formerly superintendent of the Ontario Training School for Boys at Bowmanville.

I am not going to attempt to say which is the better method, but I just point this out to show that the present leader of the CCF Party makes very positive statements, as though his opinion was not open to question, and I think that has been his attitude with respect to certain charges concerning the Ontario Training School for Girls at Galt, about which I intend to say something.

The Ontario Training School for Girls at Galt is managed by a young woman by the name of Miss Ruth Bentley. Let me tell the hon. members what the Press thinks of Miss Bentley. I am reading now from the Galt paper of January 7.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask when Miss Bentley was appointed?

MR. MYERS: Fifteen months ago. This article says:

Miss Bentley is a tall, striking brunette with sincere, deep blue eyes. A trained psychiatric social worker, she has dedicated her life to the work. She is a graduate of the University of Toronto.

Before she reported for duty this morning the writer, along with Ray Hill of the Toronto *Telegram* had the privilege of discussing the school with several members of the staff. All are mature, motherly types who pursue their allotted tasks with sympathy and understanding. All speak highly of Miss Bentley's approach to the problem in managing the 140 girls, the normal population of the school.

Let me say further that Miss Bentley graduated from the School of Social



Service in the University of Toronto in 1943. Since then she has had employment in the Province of Saskatchewan, in the United States, in England and in the Province of Ontario, and let me assure hon. members that each new position which Miss Bentley secured was better than the previous one.

I have no hesitation at all in saying that Miss Bentley is a brilliant young woman, and that the province is very fortunate indeed in having her services.

I want now to tell the hon. members something about the school at Galt and to say at the beginning that I have made visits to this school on numerous occasions during the last 3 years or so. I have been there at least 12 times in the last year, and although my knowledge of the school may be superficial, nevertheless it is real, and it is based upon observations I myself have made.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that on one occasion I went to a fashion show which the superintendent was putting on for the children. At this show, the girls, who were inmates of the school, paraded onto a platform and displayed dresses and costumes they had been making for several months before an audience of several hundred people, and the other girls of the school who were not taking part in the show.

These costumes, in my opinion, were very well made; the taste in the selection of colours was excellent, and the point I want to make here, Mr. Speaker, is how nicely it was done. A girl would come out on the stage to music, and a teacher acted as the commentator. The girl could be big and clumsy, perhaps awkward with her arms, but the commentator would say, "Just look at this attractive little number, and notice how well it is displayed by the girl who is modelling it," and the girl would prance around like a horse in a show ring, and was as pleased as "Punch." I did not know Miss Bentley at that time, but I got such a "kick" out of that show that I commented on it to the hon. Minister and his Deputy. I think that incident illustrates very well the spirit of the school.

I visited this school on many other occasions. On one occasion I attended a minstrel show; another time I attended a service at which they sang Christmas carols, and at all of these functions, there was evidence of a spirit of happiness and contentment which was unmistakable.

In addition to the shows which I saw, I called on Miss Bentley, long before the hon. leader of the CCF Party had made any charges—and Miss Bentley escorted me through the school and I saw all of the departments. Miss Bentley took me to the detention quarters, and before we went in, she said: "This is something of which we are not proud; sometimes there is nobody in the detention quarters, and when that is the case, you would be amazed at the feeling of lightheartedness throughout the school."

With that explanation, she opened the quarters, and I accompanied her in. There were two girls in small rooms—they are not cells—and she opened one room. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, this was long before the hon. leader of the CCF Party made his charges—and one little girl who was there said, "Miss Bentley, I have been thinking things over, and I will try to deserve joining the Canadian Girl Guides."

The door of her room was then locked, and we went to see the other girl, who said, "Well, Miss Bentley, I will be eligible for dismissal in a few months, but I have been thinking things over, and I want to stay here for another year." She said, "I am not prepared to face my family now."

In both cases, there was not the slightest trace of anger nor fear and, more than that, it seemed quite evident to me that these two girls who were delinquent had gained a great deal by being placed by themselves and permitted—almost forced—to think things over, and endeavour to evolve plans for their future lives.

Mr. Speaker, may I just describe the detention quarters before I leave this subject?

At the Galt School, there is a series of 7 rooms which are exactly the same as any of the other bedrooms in the school, except there is a heavy wire screen over each window, and while there is an absence of furniture, each girl is permitted a mattress, springs, and bed clothes. There are walls on the four sides, but before we went into the place at all, Miss Bentley said, "The girls can easily talk to each other through the walls; they are far from sound-proof," and I listened, and I heard the girls talking.

I asked what the routine was for the girls in detention, and I was told that they were permitted to read. They can have all the books they wish.

The House Mother in charge of that wing gets them up at about 7.30 in the morning, and they have a quick wash and brush their teeth. They are then locked up, and the House Mother takes the rest of the house—and this is one section of the large house—into breakfast, and after breakfast, the House Mother—or "Supervisor" as she is called—takes the girls to the Chapel, and from there they go to their several jobs.

The House Mother then returns to the detention quarters, and lets the girls out of detention. This happens about 9.30 in the morning. The girls from detention are obliged to clean the hallways and the detention quarters. They then have a bath, and are furnished with clean pyjamas, and they are locked in their rooms about 11.30. This allows them two hours to mingle with each other.

The House Mother is then obliged to lock them up because the rest of the house is going to its luncheon. Meals are brought to the girls in detention at 11.45. After luncheon, the House Mother comes back to her house, and she goes into the detention quarters at least once every hour during the entire 24 hours of the day. That is what is called "detention".

It is, of course, unfortunate that there has to be detention. However, it is very interesting to know that the time spent

by girls in detention is decreasing very greatly indeed. At the present time, as I have said, there are 7 rooms used as detention quarters, and that has been the case since the school was built. Up until last May, however, there were extra detention rooms, one in each house, and the number of girls in detention, in the last 3 months of 1954, numbered 94; whereas, the number of girls in detention during the last 3 months of 1955 was reduced to 48, or about a 50 per cent. reduction of the number of girls in detention from the previous year.

The school has a very interesting staff. It consists of women called "supervisors" or "House Mothers" who are in charge of the residence blocks; and there is a staff of teachers, all holding regular certificates. There are also two qualified nurses, and, in addition there are 3 very important part-time members of the staff. One is a psychiatrist, who spends one day per week in Galt, and more if his services are required. That is Dr. Atcheson, who is attached to the Toronto Family Court. The regular physician is Dr. Marrott, a lady doctor, who comes to the school twice a week.

Then there is another most important member of the part-time staff, and that is the clergyman. He is in charge of the religious life of the school, which he conducts in a non-denominational way. He gives religious instruction to all these girls. He interviews them when they enter the school; he keeps his own notes of those interviews, he counsels them frequently, and sees girls in detention. His work is to get as close as possible to their problems, which they discuss very freely with him.

And I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the qualities of the gentleman who fulfils this very important job. He is Dr. Findlay Stewart, the clergyman in charge of St. Andrews Presbyterian Church in Kitchener. He has been in Kitchener for the last 18 years, and has been a clergyman for the last 22 years. Before entering the ministry, he was a school teacher in Ottawa, and at the

present time is chairman of the High School Board of the City of Kitchener.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, where it is thought would be found the largest Presbyterian Church in Canada? It is not in one of those municipalities which so often boast of its residents of Scottish descent, but it is Dr. Stewart's church in the City of Kitchener.

I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that he is doing a great work, and, with your permission and that of the hon. members of the House, I shall read what he has to say about the school. I interviewed Dr. Stewart with my stenographer and I had her reduce what he said to writing so that I can quote it without any mistakes. This is what he said:

If you take any home from a personal and disciplinary point of view and expose it to the public Press, it will in almost every instance be quite embarrassing. As chairman of a school board, I know perfectly well that if the problems of any school become public property they will be embarrassing.

The problem of the rehabilitation of a juvenile delinquent is a grave one, and the first essential is to establish a well ordered society and to have the child conform to the rules and regulations of the society. Establishing that society is essential, and then within it establishing a system of motivation, rewards and discipline.

I have no hesitation in saying a real measure of progress has been made. The girls have responded exceptionally well to the system of incentives. The academic instruction under present conditions is on a par with regular academic instruction under the Department of Education.

The recreation programme has been fully maintained and developed.

The girls attend church service in Kitchener once a month.

The grounds are maintained by the staff with the assistance of the girls. In many years, they have never been finer.

The girls in detention can see me if they express the wish to do so. I visited the 12-year-old girl in detention once. The detention quarters are in many cases superior to the homes from which they come. The subject of detention has been discussed in classes.

I have never seen any evidence of excessive cruelty. It seems to compare with detention under other regimes.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Stewart was a member of the staff before Miss Bentley came to the school.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now say something about a 12-year-old girl, which has not already been said by the hon. Minister. The hon. leader of the CCF Party, in a statement he gave to the Press, makes this charge: "In the last year, this girl has become almost unrecognizably a different personality," the implication being that this change is the fault of Miss Bentley.

In order that hon. members might decide whether there has been a change for the worse in the last year, or since Miss Bentley's time, let us see what the record of the girl was before Miss Bentley came.

She arrived at the school in July, 1953—14 months before Miss Bentley came. On August 31, 1954—again before Miss Bentley came—there is this report of her progress taken from the school records:

Jean is an extremely disrupting child in the School. Academic classes are impossible when Jean attends. Dr. Atcheson recommends her early placement with her mother. Placement in a foster home, we feel, is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, here is a report on her progress academically for the year 1954:

Taking a vocational course in Home Eco. House, Laundry, Arts and Crafts, full time (this was during the summer of 1954).

Progress—nil.



She was never promoted. She ran away 4 times during the first 4 months she was in Galt.

I shall now read an extract from the psychiatrist's report which was made before Miss Bentley came to the school. The hon. Minister read some of it, and I shall read a little more. It is as follows:

This 11-year-old girl was examined on July 24, 1954. Reference is made to the previous appraisal of the problem in November, 1953. Every attempt at a consistent kindly but firm programme with the girl has been of only limited usefulness. The child still has not identified herself with the programme of the school, is a continued problem of either threatening to run away or disagreement with other children and members of the staff.

On present examination she demonstrates a sullen, hostile attitude and the confusion in terms of judgment that she demonstrated in the previous examination is still present. It would be my opinion that a fairly adequate trial of her ability to profit by the Training School has been given.

The problem becomes one of assessing whether or not any different approach can be made to the girl. I have no direct suggestion as I do not feel you can meet this case from a counselling point of view. A similar experience with other Indian children would tend to confirm my opinion.

I want to emphasize that all of this was reported before Miss Bentley made her appearance at the school at all.

What has happened after that is very much along the same line. On one occasion, she took her bed apart when in detention, and she "whacked" the supervisor with one of the iron pieces.

I asked one of the instructors in commercial subjects, who was there before Miss Bentley came, how she got along with this child and she said: "Jean will not take part in the programmes of the classes. On one occasion she opened a window and climbed right out during class."

On one occasion, the girls in one house, including this particular girl, decided they would "raise a rumpus." They smashed every light, smashed the windows, got pails of water, and defied the supervisor coming up the stairs. That is the "wild, free spirit of the north" which the hon. member thinks should be handled at the Galt school without difficulty.

MR. MacDONALD: I never said anything like that at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MYERS: The hon. member implied it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for York South does not know what he said.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member from Waterloo South does not know. The hon. Minister is right.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member has forgotten, he has said so much. He is all mixed up.

MR. MYERS: I want to go on and I do not want to labour the point, as the hon. Minister cleared it up pretty well. I have some other things to say yet. This is a sad, sad story, sad enough to make one weep. I shall read what the hon. member said. The hon. member is an artist in the composition of literary articles. I have never seen anything like it. Here is what he said:

Here is another significant part of the story. The child's whole nervous system was going from bad to worse, so what was done for her? She was fed sedatives. But she had been driven to such a point of desperation that she decided she was going to end it all, so after she had saved a handful of the sedatives, she took them. That did not do the trick, so, later on in the same day, she slashed her wrist with a piece of glass in an attempt to take her life.

That sounds like pretty sad stuff, but what are the facts? The girl had said on other occasions that she had

swallowed bobby pins, or something like that, but it was not so. The girl was far from truthful. In fact, the one person who believes her in every circumstance is the hon. member for York South.

The supervisor who gave her these pills did not see how the girl could have taken any. Nevertheless, the girl alleged she had taken a handful. What result did a handful of sedatives have on the girl? It had no result, it had not the least effect. There was no stomach pump used or antidote given, and Dr. Atcheson saw her afterwards. What did the doctor do? Nothing. Dr. Atcheson said he did not believe the girl made a suicide attempt.

The hon. member goes a little further and says that not only did this girl attempt suicide by swallowing a handful of sedatives but that she also obtained a piece of glass and cut her wrist. Let us see what Miss Bentley says.

MR. MacDONALD: I never met the girl, incidentally, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MYERS: This is the report on the incident of cutting her wrist—and it was not on the same day as the alleged swallowing of sedatives, but on the following day:

Jean, apparently unprovoked, attacked one of the supervisors giving her several blows hard enough to “wind” the lady and cause bruises, and a feeling that her ribs were broken. Jean refused to go back in her room, she paraded round the hallway swearing at staff, being insolent and quite out of control. She took the glass out of the fire alarm and made some superficial scratches on her wrist, just enough to draw blood which she smeared around on her face and arms. Force had to be used to get the girl back in her room. Jean was in a condition of real infantile rage, completely unreasonable, and in the real behaviour of the psychopath she was defying all the controls and pushing the control just as far as she could.

Let me point out that at no time did Miss Bentley or any other member of the staff attempt to slap this girl. They “took it all.” I do not know why.

MR. MacDONALD: The strap is not used in that school, we are told.

MR. MYERS: When this girl was in detention, she was permitted to go out whenever her condition warranted—which was about half the time—up to the time she was sent to the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. When she went to that hospital, they prescribed largactil. The effect of the drug was to calm her, to make her more amenable to reason.

Immediately after she came back from the hospital, her privileges could be enlarged because of the medication. The superintendent of the school even permitted her to go from detention to the Galt Public Library, a matter of two or three miles, so that she could select the books she wished to read. She is a voracious reader and spent a great deal of time reading. She is a clever girl, if only she would settle down.

MR. MacDONALD: If given a bit of help.

MR. MYERS: May I enquire how, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MALONEY: From the affable but gullible hon. member for York South.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member is gullible, all right. He swallowed it all.

MR. MYERS: I wish to draw attention now to what seems an extraordinary thing. The hon. member for York South has been referring a great deal to “facts,” but he never produces any.

Let me read now what *Hansard* says, on page 132. This is when he told how he had corroborative evidence of everything he said. He would not tell us what the evidence was but he said he was satisfied with it, and so why should not we all be satisfied also? He told us of

the contents of one letter, but did not divulge names. This is what he said, as reported in *Hansard*—and before I commence to read let me ask hon. members to try to put their fingers on any fact:

I want to make this general observation—

MR. MacDONALD: This was a “general observation,” not a “fact.”

MR. MYERS:

“—before I get down to specific cases, that all of my information is not, as the hon. Minister said, from disgruntled inmates, but it is from professional people of the highest standing; people who have left The Department of Reform Institutions, and taken positions in other organizations, in many instances at a much higher salary; people who left The Department of Reform Institutions because, as they say, they were “sickened and saddened” at what was going on in the particular institution in which they were employed.

Let me give you all a little lesson in law, and show you how lawyers would test the veracity or otherwise of that statement. Here is an occasion where a number of ex-employees from a number of institutions are all alleged to have used these words: “As they say, they were sickened and saddened.” I think that is an extraordinary thing, that you get a number of people from a number of institutions all using the rather extraordinary words “sickened and saddened.”

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, let me correct the hon. member. It is not “as they say,” but, “as I said.” If it appears as “they” in *Hansard*, it is incorrect. I used it in an earlier statement.

MR. MYERS: Let me deal with the words “sickened and saddened,” and show that the words “sickened and saddened” are entirely meaningless.

MR. MacDONALD: They are part of my poetical phraseology.

MR. MYERS: Part of your poetical imagination—and it is good.

MR. MALONEY: The hon. member will never be a Shelley.

MR. MYERS: He says: “By *what* they saw,” but he does not say what it was they saw. He reaches the conclusion, but will not tell the facts upon which the conclusion is based.

MR. MacDONALD: Will the hon. member read the rest of the speech?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not make the hon. member for York South feel too badly. He feels guilty now.

MR. MYERS: Then he says “there are some people on the staff,” and he reads a letter which he received from “these people.” He says he verified all these things. I wonder how.

He received a letter from some people in St. Catharines. I would like to comment on it. The St. Catharines people say:

We have followed with much interest your investigation into the training schools at Cobourg, Bowmanville and finally at Galt. We agree fully with what we have read.

My wife and I have been working with the Children's Aid Society. In May 1954 two sisters of 13 and 14 years of age were placed in our care by the society while their case was being investigated. They were with us almost 3 weeks and were sent to Galt. They were industrious, healthy girls, eager to please us and very patient and co-operative in spite of constant visits from investigators.

That is before they were committed. One wonders why people like that are ever sent to jail.

MR. MacDONALD: This was the decision of the Children's Aid Society, and the comments the hon. member is reading are the comments of those people.



MR. MYERS:

We became very much attached to them and agreed to visit them and take them back when they were released if they would work with us."

I do not want to tell you why the girls were in Galt, but I may say there were 4 members of this family in jail at the same time.

Since that time they have written every week, we have answered each letter and visited them each month. We had them with us for their Christmas leave in 1954 and again this year. The older girl was released this Christmas and has started attending high school and living with us.

Until Christmas 1954 one girl had never been punished and the other one only once.

So far, there is nothing said about Miss Bentley, that I have heard.

When we returned them to the school after their leave, Miss Bentley was in charge. She at once began to make cruel remarks. . . .

What kind of remarks are "cruel remarks"? I have no idea. The letter continues:

. . . and to remind them that they were beginning another "6 months' stretch".

What that means, I do not know.

MR. MacDONALD: Another 6 months' stretch.

MR. MYERS:

She was so brutal that we were shocked and had to leave them broken-hearted.

They do not say what "shocked" them or of what the brutality consisted.

From that time on conditions for them became worse and worse.

How, we do not know.

The older girl has a stoppage in her speech and this seemed to infuriate the supervisor and they were both punished many times.

What the punishment was we do not know. We know that each girl was given 5 days' detention in 15 months, and one of them had never been in detention up to that time.

We asked the Children's Aid to help us have the girls released and we agreed to take full responsibility. The society was fully aware of the situation and agreed with us that the situation was very bad. However, as they had other girls in the institution at the time they hesitated to act. They did agree to write asking for a report on the girls' progress hoping this show of interest might have some effect.

We asked the society's advice on appealing to the Minister of Reform Institutions. After careful consideration they advised against it on the grounds that unless we were able to secure Miss Bentley's dismissal she would be certain to take reprisals against the girls.

MR. MacDONALD: Is not that an interesting comment from a local Children's Aid Society, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MYERS: It would have been very easy for the leader of the CCF Party to verify it. I telephoned to the superintendent of the Children's Aid Society, and he said that the statement was completely false.

MR. MacDONALD: Which Children's Aid Society? There are hundreds throughout the province.

MR. MYERS: I telephoned to the one at St. Catharines. Anyway, there can be no doubt about it. Mr. Elliott was the man to whom I spoke.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It would seem that the hon. member for Waterloo South must have had the right one. There is no reply from the hon. member for York South.

MR. MacDONALD: It is in the right area.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It must have been the right one.

MR. MYERS:

We wrote the school asking that at least one of the girls be released at the end of the class term in June. We were assured that it would be considered but when the time arrived our representative Mrs. Forbes phoned us that the supervisor had refused.

I have not done this in very good order, and I would now like to go back and say something of the principle on which the school is operated.

The school is run in the following manner: the superintendent believes that the best way of re-establishing these girls is to establish them in a well-ordered society, and by a system of rewards and penalties, to enable them to take their place in that society, and that is the way the school is run.

As every girl enters the school she is given a black bow, and after she has been there for 4 months, her case is reviewed by a Board of Review consisting of the superintendent and 5 or 6 staff members. There are reports from supervisors, nurses and teachers of that girl. I have some here. There are 6 or 7 reports on each girl, and each of these reports is considered by the Board of Review.

If the girl is found worthy, she is given a tie of a different colour. She starts with a black tie; next she is given a green tie. After she is given a green tie her case is reviewed in another 4 months, and, if she has earned it, she is given a red tie. After she has had a red tie for 4 months she is permitted to go out, but if she has not done the things she is supposed to do, her ties are taken away and she begins the process again.

This girl lost her red tie and she did not go out in June. That is the system of the school.

We then asked that the older girl be released in time to enter high school in September. This also was refused and we went to the school to make a personal appeal. Miss Bentley immediately lost her temper and told us they were "the worst liars in the school," "typical delinquents" and "the most stupid girls in the school."

They were doing very poorly in their class work due to the fact that they were under such severe strain and lost time through detentions.

At the time this letter was received only one girl had been in detention in 15 months.

We again considered asking the department's help but received information that made it clear to us that the supervisor could not be reached in this way. The older girl was in detention across the hall from the Indian girl at the time of her suicide attempt. Your investigation has given us the opening we have been hoping for. We are willing to do anything in our power to have this institution rid of its trouble.

Up to this point there is no fact mentioned except the fact about the Children's Aid.

We have found Miss Bentley entirely unco-operative, vindictive, terribly cruel and extremely rude to parents and visitors.

There is nothing proved there. But here is presumed to be a fact, and it is:

She has never had the grace to rise from her desk to welcome us or to bid us good-bye.

That may be a fact. That may be true, Mr. Speaker. She did not have the "grace" to rise. That shows in some measure, the type of person who wrote this. It is just ridiculous. He goes on further to say:

She has gone out of her way to embarrass our girls with unkind remarks. She has searched them in a most disgusting way in our presence.

What is the "most disgusting way?" I would not know.

I have several points I wish to make: one girl was released last Christmas for the purpose of going to high school. She went to high school for 12 or 18 days. Before she went to high school, it was her job at the home of the people who wrote the letter to milk the cows. Then she went to school.

How long did she stay in the high school, because the sole purpose of her release was to enable her to go to school? She left school on January 18, after about 15 days. Then what happened to her? She got a job earning \$10 a week at the corner store. Was Miss Bentley asked if it would be all right to take the girl from school? Not a bit. Those are facts.

These people talk about "searching in a disgusting way." Miss Bentley says she does not remember searching the girls at all. It is not usual for her to search. She sometimes goes through the pockets of the girls for matches. She says that procedure is particularly necessary in the case of these girls. One of these girls at one time earned the privilege of taking employment in the town, and earning a little money, but she lost that privilege because she came home with matches. I do not need to say how dangerous it is for matches to be around the school. That is why she lost the privilege.

There are more things here about which I want to speak. The hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) told us of the extra-curricular programme, but the hon. member for York South makes some charges, too. I want to deal with this just briefly, because the hon. Minister has dealt with it more fully. The hon. member for York South said "there previously was organized recreation under a qualified supervisor; now it is virtually eliminated." They have physical training to music. I have seen them playing ball to music. They have gym suits.

Here is an extraordinary thing. Before Miss Bentley came to that school there was an epidemic in the school. The girls had an extraordinary habit

of carving. They would get glass from a window and would carve the name of some one they liked or hated on their legs with glass. The idea was that when healed there would be a scar formed with the initials of the person they had put there. That was quite an amazing thing, but it was a common habit before Miss Bentley went there. Now it is non-existent.

The skating rink is busy every night, and on Saturdays and Sundays. I have here a newspaper clipping about their physical training programme. Let me read you something which appeared a few days ago in the Press:

Preston Bantam All-Stars nearly lost an exciting game yesterday afternoon when they managed to struggle through with a 7-5 win over a hard-trying girls' team from the Ontario Training School for Girls at Galt.

Playing in the school's rink, the boys found themselves a little surprised at times in the way the girls could navigate on skates with a hockey stick and puck.

Harold MacDonald, chief engineer at the school and coach of the school team, had his girls playing a fine style of hockey with Kay Burnett, captain of the team scoring twice to give the boys something to worry about.

That happened in this place where there was "no physical training."

Another thing the hon. member for York South said was:

Arts and crafts studies were once offered, but they are no longer.

There is no basis of truth in that statement whatever—none at all. There is a woman on the staff who is a graduate of the Swansea School of Arts. She takes the extra-curricular art work; there is a Grade 8 teacher who is good at art. In every house are poster paper, paints and crayons so the girls can do all the drawings they like in the evening.

I have many of the drawings here. I think they are rather good and I will show them to the hon. member. They are not the best, but, after all, they are something.



I thought part of this art programme was intriguing. The instructor would play a classical piece of music on the gramophone. There would be a commentator. On one of these occasions "Peter and the Wolf" by Tchaikovsky was played on the gramophone; the bass and the bassoons played their little bit, and the commentator said, "This is where the old grandfather comes in." The girls were asked to draw from that description and from the music their conceptions of that old grandfather.

These may not be the best paintings in the world, but let me show them to you. There is the grandfather. This is only one; there are dozens of "grandfathers" on the walls all around the school. I thought the hon. member might like to see them. This came from a place where, according to the hon. member, "there is no art." You will notice, too, how a student got the Russian features in the painting.

Here is another extra-curricular picture. This is a poster for St. Valentine's Day on February 14. I was hoping I could have spoken earlier and sent the poster with an invitation to the next fashion show, but I was too late. It took place last Tuesday. This is a nice picture showing a beaded dress. There are many more than these. Here is another one. I asked a little girl to draw me a picture. That is what she drew. They are not too bad. This one is not bad for a 14-year-old girl done in a place where they "do not teach art."

The hon. member, in his speech, said other things which are just as silly. He said:

there used to be a garden but this year there was none, it was stopped because the girls were taking too many radishes and carrots out of it.

During the time Miss Bentley has been at the school there has never been a carrot or a radish grown in the garden. So how could they have been taken? However, last year there were 80 rose bushes planted, 600 bulbs, and you will remember that Dr. Findlay Stewart said the garden has never appeared finer.

It is not the system of the school to have compulsory work parties. All the work done at this school is on a voluntary basis and it is surprising how willing the girls are to do their bit.

Something was said about the library. Two girls are allowed to go to the Galt Public Library every Saturday all day. One works upstairs in the children's department, and one downstairs. Both girls meet the public, and are treated in exactly the same way as the rest of the library staff. These girls who go to the library are the ones in charge of the school libraries. The school library has 650 books. The circulation at the school is even greater than the circulation of books in the public library.

It was a rather amazing thing to learn this "wild child of the northern woods" is a clever child. She reads such books as *Oliver Twist*, in an abridged form.

She is a bright girl. Perhaps that is her trouble, she is too bright. And don't tell me that her case is not well understood by the school which sympathizes with her.

The most popular group activity there is the extracurricular subject, of the Girl Cadets, which is completely voluntary and to which almost all of the girls in the school belong. Two sergeant-instructors from the Highland Light Infantry come to the school each week and they inspect and instruct these girls. You would be surprised how they react, and the girls are really tired when the drill is over. They are very proud of being cadets. There are sergeants, staff sergeants and corporals, and the only way they get promotion is by earning it.

I was at the school perhaps 8 months ago and I observed the girls walking around the grounds. It was noticeable that they walked smartly, there was none of this "lolling". I said to Miss Bentley: "It is amazing how these girls walk. Do you have rules, such as, so many paces a minute?" She said: "No, it is the spirit engendered as a result of their cadet training." It was simply amazing.

There are two very good social workers at the school, Dr. Findlay

Stewart and Miss Bentley herself, who is a brilliant girl. They give personal and group counselling, which they think is the proper way of approaching the subject of reform.

The hon. member for York South says "individual treatment offers the only real possibility of rehabilitation," and while I have not gone into this extensively it must be realized that the whole business of attempting to reform these delinquent children is only beginning to be understood.

In this connection, I should like to read something from a book entitled *The Treatment of the Delinquent Adolescent*. It is published by Harris B. Peck, M.D., Director, Bureau of Mental Health Services, New York City Court of Domestic Relations, Lecturer in Psychiatry, the New York School of Social Work, Columbia University. It is co-authored by Virginia Bellsmith, Professor and Assistant Dean, the New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, and so on. I do not intend to read very much, but I would like to read this excerpt:

Agencies that work with delinquent adolescents have initiated group treatment largely in an attempt to reach certain individuals who seem unable to profit from individual treatment. The failure of individual treatment for those delinquents is often the equivalent of a sentence of doom, since most of them have had a try at many other available community resources.

I quote this only for the reason that the hon. member for York South makes the positive statement that "the only way to reach these persons is the individual way."

The hon. member claims also that the "custodial staff is increased and that is a bad thing." However, it is very natural, because the population of the school was 109 in 1953, and rose to 138 in 1955, with a corresponding staff increase.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member is looking for what he is going to speak about next, I wonder if he would try to equate his highly romanticized story with one paragraph I would like to read?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member for York South wait a moment.

We have here the testimony available to all hon. members of the House, by one who has been in this institution a dozen different times in the last year, as opposed to the statements by the hon. member for York South, who was never in the place at all, and who never met these people.

MR. MacDONALD: Passing on statements consisting of superficial information.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, now, now; he has been there.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for Waterloo South continue his speech.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit my asking a question?

MR. MYERS: Certainly.

MR. MacDONALD: My question is this: How do you equate the kind of story you have given with this comment, which is not mine?

HON. MR. FROST: From where did the hon. member get this?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member has permitted the question.

MR. MYERS: The person who wrote it has a different view from me, I suppose, but go ahead.

MR. MacDONALD: Here is a commentary, for example, in an editorial a few days ago in the *Toronto Star*:

There is evidence that Mr. MacDonald is right in his general charges of serious trouble in the department.

For example, Miss Ruth Bentley, Director of the Girls Training School at Galt, was recently quoted as saying: "Lots of things I do here would be frowned on by social workers." From Miss Bentley's own statement the Galt Training School for Girls is apparently a girls' prison, run largely according to obsolete prison standards.

MR. MYERS: I hope that if the writer is a fair-minded person, he will change his views. Am I speaking too long, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MacDONALD: Wait until the full report of what the social workers think comes out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MYERS: This charge was published on January 7 and on the following Monday—the 7th being Saturday—I received a telephone call from a manufacturer in Galt who said to me:

I read Mr. MacDonald's charges. They are simply terrible and I want you to do something about them.

That is what this well-known citizen of Galt said to me on the telephone on Monday, and this is the letter which he wrote to me on Tuesday:

As a result of two conversations today, which incidentally I did not start, I am convinced that I was out of order in expressing my opinion to you over the phone last night. Please accept my apologies and consider this a complete retraction. Both parties are well acquainted with the superintendent, Miss Bentley, and were quite antagonistic over the criticism of the institution which has occurred.

Now that is gossip, if you like, but that is the opinion of some of the best people in Galt.

MR. MacDONALD: I can give you a letter showing what other people think.

MR. MYERS: But you have not done so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MYERS: Here is an amazing letter which I received from an old man of 86, a very kindly gentleman. Let me read it to the hon. members, it is interesting:

Dear Sir:

About the Girls' School, it is all lies and the dirty work of the CCF.

MR. MacDONALD: Here are the "facts" now.

MR. MYERS: Let me go on:

I know Mr. "Art" Peiffer of Preston. He is the gardener and does outside work. I phoned to him and he stated that the girls' school is well taken care of. He has been there a long time.

This is just a common opinion around town, Mr. Speaker.

There is in Galt a woman, who for 35 years, was a commercial teacher in the Galt high school and ended by being in charge of the commercial department, senior to 8 other teachers. She spends her time now in performing good works and if ever there was a kindly person, it is Miss Weatherill. She spends a good deal of time taking old people around the country, and is a great worker in the Red Cross movement—the kind of woman whom the boys and girls she used to teach come to see all the time.

She was invited to go to the school for 3 months in the heat of the summer in order to relieve the regular commercial teacher, and she went. She says that she did not want to go, that it was hot and she did not want reform institution work anyway, but she said she went there and came back feeling elated. She said she was well experienced in getting the "feel" of any institution and that from her 3-month stay there, she got the distinct feeling that it was a well-run institution, under a very kindly head.

To get away from the vague statements, let me become more specific.

MR. MacDONALD: It is about time.



MR. MYERS: Miss Wetherill said that the girls discussed with her the question of detention, that it was quite a thing in an institution when somebody goes to detention as the feeling is spread throughout the entire school. There was at that time a girl who had run away, had been caught and put in detention, and another girl who had been in detention before; they discussed the matter with Miss Weatherill and one said: "Well, so-and-so will have to 'learn the hard way,' if she will not take advice. I have been in detention and I 'learned the hard way,' too.

This lady went to the morning assembly and said she was amazed at the tact Miss Bentley showed in addressing the school. She did not single out any individual for either censure or praise, but she did mention to groups that something was well done or something had been badly done. During these discussions in the morning, detention was touched upon and they were urged to be good girls and earn their red bow and be able to get out.

A great number of people are doing a great work in assisting the government in the operation of institutions like this, and I would like to commend them. In the morning the children go to an assembly room for prayers, and then are sent off to their duties for the day. Miss Bentley talks to the girls before they disperse to their work. The Music Teachers' Association of Galt has been doing a great work there, they go to the school and play music and sing. That has been going on for a long, long time.

Recently a Mrs. Cole, who conducts "Women in the News" on television at Kitchener, went to the school and gave the girls a talk. So did the woman personnel director of the United Typewriter Company, who told the girls: "Now when you are going out to get a job, you do this and that, you do not put on red nail polish, you dress neatly" and so on. She spoke for nearly three-quarters of an hour.

Recently a flower consultant came and told the girls how to arrange flowers

and presented corsages for the fashion show which took place last night. Another chap came out and spoke about birds. A girl who runs a handicraft shop in Galt goes out there and tells the girls what they should do by way of hobbies, and I think all that is a pretty fine programme in a place which is reported to have "no arts and no crafts."

Some letters have appeared in the Press. I shall not quote very many of them but I shall quote one from a woman named Ellis, which appeared in the *Toronto Star* on January 18.

MR. MacDONALD: Is the hon. member going to quote the reply which somebody put in 10 days afterward?

MR. MYERS: I have not seen it.

MR. MacDONALD: That is the sort of thing you should look at.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MYERS: If you do not want me to read it, I do not care, there has been so much written about it anyway. However, let me read it.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, go ahead.

MR. MYERS:

As a former employee of the Galt Training School for Girls, I would like an opportunity to express a few facts concerning the remarks made of the school by Donald C. MacDonald. As a social worker, I was employed by the GTS for 3 years and worked closely with Ruth Bentley and her predecessor as superintendent. I would like to mention briefly a few of the innovations that have been established by Miss Bentley.

First of all, a cadet corps was organized a year ago. The corps is composed of 3 platoons of volunteers. The girls wear tartan uniforms which they make themselves. There was a great deal of eagerness to join the corps.

Another important addition was the organization of a large voluntary

choir. The girls were chosen from an eager waiting list for their ability and interest in music. Another favourite activity was the formation of the first GTS bugle band. Training originally was given by members of the Preston Boys Band.

The first GTS hockey team was in action during the winter of 1954. Likewise, the following summer a baseball team proudly wore school colours and played visiting teams at the school and in the community.

Another important item was the setting up of an active circulating library for the girls. This was done with the co-operation of the Galt Public Library. The girls had their own library, and did their own cataloguing, handling and caring for the books. Arts and crafts, such as raffia work, clay modelling, felt and shell work were encouraged by Miss Bentley. The results of the handiwork may be seen throughout the institution.

I would just like to add that I feel Miss Bentley is doing the best with what she has to work with at the present time. Whether the Galt training school is helping those committed to its care can only be measured by the future adjustment the girls make upon their return to the community.

MR. MacDONALD: Now, let the hon. member read the reply from other social workers.

MR. MYERS: I do not care.

HON. MR. FOOTE: And the girl who wrote that letter is one of the best social workers in the country.

MR. MYERS: That is a letter from Miss Ellis, who used to be with The Department of Reform Institutions, but is no longer, and I cannot see any reason why this should not be accepted.

Let me say something more; shortly after the hon. leader of the CCF Party made his charges, the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) did a very wise and courageous thing, he threw the institutions

of the province open to the Press. Robert J. Hanley of the Hamilton *Spectator*, a member of our Press Gallery paid a visit to the Galt School, and reported his visit in the Hamilton *Spectator*, and I would like to read just a little of what he said. This is written by Mr. Hanley, from Galt, on January 12:

Ontario's delinquency and crime story, and the government's controversial correction programme, begins here in Galt. And here the *Spectator* yesterday began a survey of provincial reform institutions.

Why here?

Because at the Girls' Training School (Galt) they deal with little girls as young as 10 and as old as 17—girls whose small sins are the beginning of the progressive story of Ontario crime—breaking or broken homes, deprivation, emotional insecurity, sexual activities which thrill away boredom, alcohol, drugs, theft, violence.

For part of the day and most of the evening, we talked with the girls and the security staff. We saw "the hole" and talked with 4 girls in "solitary".

Condition of the buildings was excellent, the behaviour of the residents commendable.

It was not a "parade" in the institutional or military sense, but rather an opportunity to look around casually and to check for complaints which smacked of reform stupidity, the lack of fairness or humanity.

Even before the report begins, we commend this opinion.

There is no doubt that the "new regime" as it was labelled by Donald MacDonald, CCF leader, and which dates back 15 months, is more severe and security-minded than its predecessors.

But as it is firm, it is also fair and imaginative. It is operated on the premise that the school was intended to be an institution of correction and reform for female juveniles.

It is to no appearance inhuman, nor are the conforming girls unhappy.

There is adequate opportunity for learning and recreation. While the learning is imposed, the recreation can be taken away when it is apparent that little effort is being made to become reformed.

From the history of the girls when they came, it seemed that they would leave the institution wiser, happier, in better health, better disciplined, better prepared to find the means of living nicely, and within the law.

Mr. Hanley goes on with a great deal more, and it is all in the same vein. He also went to the Mercer and there met this 13-year-old girl to whom I have already referred. Let me read what he says, as reported in the *Hamilton Spectator* of January 21:

*Spectator* Reporter Robert J. Hanley, inspecting Ontario's reformatories for a series of articles in this newspaper, interviewed the 13-year-old girl who spent parts of 92 consecutive days in the solitary cell at Galt.

During that time, she said, she was out of detention for day-time work on many occasions but had to spend 92 consecutive nights in solitary.

The girl, who is now at Mercer Reformatory, admitted that her persistent refusal to co-operate with the authorities was the cause of her punishment.

Can we get any clearer statement than that on the nature of her confinement?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member explain why, if everything is so right in the Mercer, they had a minor riot recently as a result of which the department, after 4 years of legal friction, has finally attempted some real segregation of the Training School girls in the institution?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would the hon. member for York South please be seated?

HON. MR. FOOTE: I would be glad to explain it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MYERS: Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the subject fully, and may I say that it seems to me that if there has been any "incredible cruelty" as alleged by the hon. member for York South, it has been on his part in charging, without any adequate foundation, a very fine and capable civil servant.

MR. MacDONALD: That is a matter of opinion.

HON. L. M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Would the hon. member for Waterloo South, in completing his very remarkable exposition and explanation of the work of this institution—

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister should not get too far out on the limb.

HON. MR. FROST: Would the hon. member for Waterloo South be prepared to take the hon. member for York South up to Galt and show him around?

MR. MYERS: I should be delighted. Let me say if the hon. member for York South is a responsible man, I can assure him—

MR. MacDONALD: I will be very glad when my time will permit me, but it will not be on a conducted-tour basis.

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, may I add my voice to those congratulating you upon your appointment.

In the Speech from the Throne, certain matters were dealt with in connection with mining in Ontario on a broad scale, and I think it is wise to inform the House in more particular detail as to what is taking place in The Department of Mines and in the mining industry in Ontario.



It is probably the first year in our history that we can point to any corner of this province and see developments of new industries, new minerals, new metals, throughout the Province of Ontario. I will start in the southeastern part of the province and not only deal with these properties which have now come into production, but give a little outline of these mines and the explorations which are going on.

In the southeastern part of this province, we have the Marmora production in which the mining of the 20-million-ton deposit of magnetite iron ore is now in full swing, the ore being pelletized and shipped to the other side of the lake where it is processed. Not too well-known to this House, nor to the people of Ontario generally, is the find of new iron ore in Renfrew County. May I say, too, in addition to this find, we have now indications of uranium ore in that same county.

The old Bancroft area, settled probably 150 years ago, today is a very important uranium-producing area in Ontario. You have the new Farraday Mine and the Bicroft Mine, employing at this time 450 men, where no one was employed one year ago. In addition to this find, there is the "Dyno" to the south and west of these deposits, south I might say of a place called Tory Hill; I do not know whether the name has anything to do with the find there, but it could be indicative.

Down in the southwestern part of Ontario, coming back to this side of the province, for many years we have had the production of gas and oil, but during the last year we have had the exploration and drilling in Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, and I might tell you that great areas are under lease with my department which will, we hope, bring into production gas from the bed of Lake Erie. Southwestern Ontario is also participating in this find.

Coming to perhaps the greatest section of Ontario—northeastern Ontario—we have a discovery of magnetite iron ore, some 40 miles north of Kapuskasing, in the James Bay Basin. The

Department of Mines is today investigating possibilities of utilizing lignite deposits some 30 miles from the ore body, in an effort to see whether or not we can use it for pelletizing this magnetite to bring it up to 90 per cent. pure grade iron ore for shipment. If this can be done, it will be the only place in central Canada where we will bring into production this high-grade ore, having the fuel and the iron ore within close proximity to one another.

In the North Bay area, in the Manitou Island group, we are now erecting a pilot mill to find out whether or not there is a possibility of erecting a greater mill to separate the columbian from the uranium deposits. We have, in the Boston Creek area, a discovery of some years ago, which is still being drilled to delineate the iron ore produced there, and arrangements have been concluded with 4 railroads whereby trainloads of ore will be shipped via the TNO, the C.N.R., across to the mills on the other side.

A major discovery of only recent vintage is the Temagami Mine on Temagami Island in Lake Temagami. It has been known for many years that copper existed in that area, and this discovery is a major discovery, the second one of copper ore in the history of Ontario.

The Sudbury story is an old one—and I would say again that I may be going "out on the limb" a bit, but not too far—when I say that today we hold 85 per cent. of the world's production of nickel. I say to you, with the delineation of ore in the Sudbury area by the various concerns operating there, we will still continue to hold 85 per cent. of the world's supply of nickel for the next 50 years.

Now I come to something which is vital, not only to northern Ontario, not to the province as a whole, but to the whole western world. We have discovered uranium deposits in Blind River of a size which indicate they are the greatest in the world, which will give us a source of atomic power in northern Ontario. This old lumbering town of Blind River has brought forth once

more, great wealth, and not only great wealth, but security to the whole western world.

Up in northwestern Ontario, in the lake area some 60 miles north of Kenora and 11 miles inside the Manitoba border, there have been major discoveries of nickel-copper ore which are being advanced, and tonight, as in all other places throughout the north which I have named to you so far, the diamond drills are going down.

Down south of that area again, in the area known as the "Populous Lake area," south of Kenora, we have new discoveries. Coming east from there and across to this new road which we hear so much about, the Atikokan Highway, on Shebandowan Lake, you have the new Bandowan property; 60 miles north of Sault Ste. Marie, and again indications are of great copper discoveries in Ontario.

May I remind this House that 3 years ago you had no copper production in Ontario. The subterranean area of Steep Rock mines will be going into production in 1962 and, so that you may have some knowledge of the least expenditure of money required to bring these properties into being, I tell this House that before one pound of iron ore will be produced by the Caland Company at Steep Rock, they will have made an expenditure of \$60 million.

I should like to tell you also that in these finds I am speaking about, and in the general state of the mining industry of Ontario, we have brought new things into production. These include uranium in the Bancroft and Blind River areas, and copper in the Manitouwadge area and Temagami, and other new products of Ontario's mining industry.

The government policy in northern Ontario has been one of accelerating the filing of geological information. Today we are putting out more geological reports than ever before. We have here today a report of work finished or otherwise for the past year in the construction of mining and access roads, totalling 228 miles.

There are many factors which will affect northern Ontario; probably the greatest factor in the development of northern Ontario is the attitude of the hon. members of this House towards that vast area of this province, and they should realize from this great area has come \$8 billion worth of wealth, and in the past two years we have supplemented that figure by \$2 billion worth of uranium in the Blind River area alone. I think we should think about it and plan to go forward in the development of this part of the province with the greatest possible speed.

One of the things which would be of great benefit to northern Ontario, and one which was touched upon today, and also mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, was that of a pipe line crossing the great northern part of the province. May I say to the hon. members present that no greater thing could happen to northern Ontario than the construction of this pipe line. It is far more important to the people of the north than even the Seaway is to Ontario as a whole.

I might tell you that in some places in northern Ontario, it costs \$26 a ton for soft coal, and I understand that the price of the same coal in certain spots in the south is \$10 a ton. I am given to understand from an article I have here that there will be zoning of certain costs in the gas being transported across the north. It will be cheaper in Smooth Rock Falls than in the City of Toronto, and I might say that this reversal of economics is a great thing for northern Ontario.

I would say that the normal staking in the Department of Mines for many years has been on the order of 12,000 to 13,000 claims; in 1953, there were 26,000 claims staked; in 1954, 50,000, and in 1955, 57,000 claims recorded in the Province of Ontario, an all-time high for any province in this great Dominion.

I can tell you that the production of minerals in Ontario this year will approximate \$600 million, which is an all-time high in the history of this

province, and I think we should be thankful for it, and when we take into consideration the, shall we say, the "boom" in this business, we should feed the horse the oats, and we should supply the access roads and build the pipe lines to keep the "boom" going.

I would like to add one thing, in my own poor way. The Conservative Party in this province and in this Dominion has had one policy throughout its history. It has always had a policy of "Canada First," and today I am glad to see that policy being accepted, not only here, but elsewhere, as a great policy for this country.

MR. MacDONALD: May I ask the hon. Minister about the pipe line, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, I will be fair in this, and say that the Party in power at Ottawa could not do a greater or a better thing than to bring it across.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. Minister read the *Ottawa Journal*, and it will tell him what the Conservative Party thinks about it.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, there has been another thing which the Conservatives have done in northern Ontario, and shows the general theme and thinking and basis for being a Conservative, and that is that in 1926, another great Conservative opened up the north as it should be. I am referring to Mr. Howard Ferguson, when he drove Highway No. 11 from North Bay to Nipigon. For that reason I believe that country comes before Party, and I can honestly and truly say that in our expansion and extension of access roads in northern Ontario, we are following out a policy laid down by Mr. Ferguson in 1926, and which was inaugurated by Rt. hon. Sir John A. MacDonald many years prior to that.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. Minister would read what Judith Robinson has had to say about the policies of Rt. hon. Sir John A. MacDonald,

the hon. member will notice who is following them out today, namely, M. J. Coldwell.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, we would not have to bring the gas so far across this country, if a pipe line could be laid from the desk of the hon. member.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, there will be another time at which I can go into other facts, dealing with The Department of Mines, than in this debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for a reply to the Speech from the Throne. However, there is one thing I would like to lay before this House, and that is that people have been living in the Town of Hornepayne for many years, and no action was taken by many governments to provide them with access to the outer world.

In the Town of Gogama, the same situation existed, and Oba and Folyette, and other similar smaller towns, were not given too much consideration until this government inaugurated a system, 4 years ago, whereby these people, as well as others in Ontario, have been provided with outlets to our highways, and by doing that I feel we have at least won the confidence of the people in northern Ontario, as indicated by the number of northern hon. members supporting this Party in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by congratulating you upon your appointment to your high office.

Hon. D. Porter moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Tomorrow afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.35 of the clock p.m.













# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Friday, February 17, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Friday, February 17, 1956

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Presentation of report, Mr. Dunbar .....</b>   | <b>309</b> |
| <b>Sarnia General Hospital, Bill respecting, Mr. Janes, second reading .....</b>  | <b>309</b> |
| <b>Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America,<br/>Bill respecting, Mr. Wintermeyer, second reading .....</b> | <b>309</b> |
| <b>City of Peterborough, Bill respecting, Mr. Yaremko, second reading .....</b>   | <b>310</b> |
| <b>Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading .....</b>   | <b>310</b> |
| <b>Board of Education for the City of Hamilton, Bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch,<br/>second reading .....</b>                                    | <b>310</b> |
| <b>Protestant Home of St. Catharines, Bill respecting, Mr. Kerr, second reading ....</b>  | <b>310</b> |
| <b>Highway Improvement Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading .....</b>  | <b>310</b> |
| <b>Mining Act, Bill (89) to amend, Mr. Kelly, second reading .....</b>  | <b>311</b> |
| <b>Mining Act, Bill (90) to amend, Mr. Kelly, held .....</b>  | <b>311</b> |
| <b>Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Mapledoram, Mr. Child,<br/>Mr. A. Frost .....</b>                                  | <b>313</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Goodfellow, agreed to .....</b>  | <b>334</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....</b>   | <b>334</b> |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1956

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming to the House this afternoon the students from the Stratford Teachers' College. They are here to view the proceedings and we hope they will enjoy this sitting of the House.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

Report relating to the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths in the Province of Ontario for the year ended December 31, 1955.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to table certain documents relating to the Bill that is now before the House dealing with the northern Ontario section of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line. This consists of correspondence passing between the Rt. hon. C. D. Howe and myself,

and also a copy of the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited, which was enclosed with Rt. hon. Mr. Howe's letter.

There is also a report to the Treasurer of Ontario from Messrs. Clarkson, Gordon and Company, known as the "Glassco Report". This correspondence and the Glassco Report are being printed, and will be available to all hon. members; but in the meantime I have copies of these documents for the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

### THE SARNIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. C. E. Janes moves second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Sarnia General Hospital."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

### THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSIONS

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer moves second reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Canada Board of American Missions of The United Lutheran Church in America."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.



## CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. J. Yaremko, in the absence of Mr. Auld, moves second reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. W. Murdoch, in the absence of Mr. Connell, moves second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE PROTESTANT HOME OF ST. CATHARINES

Mr. D. M. Kerr, in the absence of Mr. Tolley, moves second reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Protestant Home of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. James N. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Minister not going to explain the Bill on second reading?

HON. MR. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, most of the amendments contained in the Bill are for the purpose of clarifying the several sections of the Act and making them consistent with the established practice of the department, and facilitating administration. In some cases, words are added to certain sections, and words now contained therein are deleted, or more appropriate words are substituted therefor.

These amendments do not involve any change in principle.

I explained the sections wherein there was some change in principle, when I introduced the Bill. If it is the wish of anyone that I do so again, I will be glad to do so. But I suggest, as they are quite separate, one from the other, they could better be discussed in committee.

MR. H. C. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister say something about section 4, in regard to Indian reserves?

HON. MR. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the present section 33 of the Act provides for an arrangement with the Indian Affairs Branch of The Department of Mines and Resources (Canada) for the construction and improvement of a connecting link of a county road system passing through an Indian reserve. Indian affairs are now administered by The Department of Citizenship and Immigration (Canada).

This section is repealed and re-enacted so as to overcome the difficulty caused by the transfer of responsibility from one federal department to another, and to make the provisions applicable to a connecting link of a county road system passing through other lands under the control of the Government of Canada, for example, Welland Canal lands.

There is a small piece of road in the vicinity of Port Dalhousie which is concerned, and this is to legalize the spending of money in such cases.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in regard to section 5, dealing with the county engineer, which states, "subject to the approval of the Minister,

the payment of additional moneys to the county engineer may be authorized," who pays that money?

HON. MR. ALLAN: That section is inserted in order to make clear something which has been done. In the ordinary county, a county engineer is appointed by by-law, which is approved by myself; and the salary is based thereon.

This refers to the suburban road commissions, and makes possible payment to the engineer for the suburban road commission, on a motion of the suburban road commission, and he is then paid by the commission.

MR. WHICHER: Mr. Speaker, supposing there was a small municipality within the county, which did not have a county road, and they requested the county engineer to give some advice, or something like that; should they pay the county engineer for that advice, when they are already helping to pay through direct taxation to the county, in the first place?

HON. MR. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that very often the county engineer endeavours to lend any assistance to the various townships he can conveniently, but he is not required, as a county engineer, to do such things as surveying or work of that nature for the individual townships, although I believe that some townships make arrangements to have that work done by the county engineer.

MR. WHICHER: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to ask so many questions. I would like to ask the hon. Minister in regard to section 2, dealing with bridges, are there many bridges of that type?

Mr. Speaker, dealing with bridges, I understand they are a county responsibility not in the county roads system. I am not quite clear on this.

HON. MR. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, of course, bridges over 20 feet in length are the responsibility of the county. The only change in this is that word "con-

structing" was added to the previous legislation to bring this subsection in line with the following subsection.

MR. P. MANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what was the object in changing the date in section 1 from January to March 31.

HON. MR. ALLAN: The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that each municipality is advised of the amount of money The Department of Highways is prepared to subsidize, in their normal work. The former date did not give the municipality enough time to receive and consider it, and forward their by-laws. Therefore the date was extended to March 31.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE MINING ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves second reading of Bill No. 89, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

MR. OLIVER: Will this Bill be referred to committee?

HON. MR. KELLY: This Bill will be referred to committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE MINING ACT

Hon. Mr. Kelly moves second reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on that particular Bill, but it might be that the hon. Minister would prefer to make his explanation first.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill as I explained previously, it will be referred to the Committee on Mining. The purpose of the Bill is to abolish the Mining Court of Ontario and substitute therefor a

Mining Commissioner. The Bill is somewhat lengthy and will go to the Committee on Mining.

MR. WINTERMEYER: The concern I had respecting this particular Bill is, I believe, a matter of principle basically, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a constitutional problem involved.

If I may take just a moment I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in part 7 of the Bill, particularly in section 114, the "commissioner" as the hon. Minister has suggested—

HON. D. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt for a moment? If this Bill will involve some debate, I think perhaps it should be set over until Monday. I think on Friday afternoons we generally attempt to avoid any controversial Bills; if the hon. member wishes to speak on this, perhaps it should be set over until next week.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accede to that.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not wish to cut off any debate.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I appreciate that. It was of some concern to me.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better if this came up on Monday when we will not be having such a short sitting, or some time next week when the hon. members will be given full opportunity to discuss it.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am prepared to have this stand over until Monday, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading will go over until Monday.

HON. MR. PORTER: Until it is called again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer to give us some assurance that the Bill will be called relatively

quickly? I do not want to go into my explanation now, but I would suggest that if there is a constitutional problem, we might well consider what should be done about it prior to its being referred to the committee.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I think I can undertake that the Bill will be called on Monday, subject to what the hon. Prime Minister might say. I will recommend this to the hon. Prime Minister, and I am certain he will not have it called on any day when the hon. member is not present in the House.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer saying the government is not ready to go on with this Bill this afternoon?

HON. MR. PORTER: The government is prepared to go on, but if this Bill will involve a lengthy debate, we should put it over.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has to find that out as he moves along.

HON. MR. PORTER: I know, but apparently there is some difference of opinion.

MR. OLIVER: Can not hon. members say a word about the government's Bills without the government pulling them back?

HON. MR. PORTER: On Friday afternoon, as the hon. leader of the Opposition well knows, we generally close early.

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

HON. MR. PORTER: And generally any second readings which are brought forward on Friday afternoon are of Bills on which there is likely to be no lengthy controversy. If it is controversial, it would be much better to have it on a day when we would not be restricted at all as to time. Surely the hon. leader of the Opposition does not object to that.



MR. OLIVER: Then why was it brought forward today?

HON. MR. PORTER: It is only now I find that apparently there is some serious objection to this Bill in principle.

MR. OLIVER: I imagine the hon. Provincial Treasurer found that out before.

HON. MR. PORTER: I find there is so little objection to any of our Bills in principle, that generally we can put them all through on a Friday.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, that is quite in order, in so far as my motion is concerned. Ordinarily this Bill would go to the committee—as the other will be—and be discussed there. The points the hon. member wishes to bring out before the House would have been brought out there, but if the hon. members wish to discuss it at great length, it is quite all right.

HON. MR. PORTER: I think the objection to this Bill is on the principle, and I do not think the House should be asked to pass on second reading until that principle is determined.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the reason I am suggesting it be held over.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That would be very fair.

#### THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

HON. C. E. MAPLEDORAM (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take some part in this debate, I wish, of course, to congratulate you on your high honour. I know that the constituents of Dufferin-Simcoe must be very proud to be represented in the House by a member of your type.

First of all, I want to say to the newly-elected hon. members of the House that, as far as The Department of Lands and Forests is concerned, we will welcome them to our offices. I am sure they will find in The Department

of Lands and Forests people who understand their problems, and who will do anything they can to assist. This, of course, includes the older hon. members, if they have any problems.

I have enjoyed the speeches of the newly-elected hon. members of the House, particularly one or two, which I considered outstanding. Their remarks have been informative and constructive and, as I say, I have enjoyed them very much.

I was particularly interested in the remarks which had to do with the department which I have the honour to head. Regarding the remarks made by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), they were made in a very constructive manner, and I appreciated the hon. member bringing them to the attention of the House.

Not too often have we had these points raised in the House, and I think it is well that the hon. members should be entirely conversant with what is actually going on regarding fisheries in the Province of Ontario.

I would like to make a few corrections regarding what the hon. member said. I am sure the hon. member is aware of the nature of the things to which I might take objection. Referring to the fishing industry he said, in part:

Unfortunately, during the last few years, that industry has dwindled until now it is practically nil.

I think the hon. member was referring to lake trout.

MR. WHICHER: That is right.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Certainly it was no reflection on the rest of the industry, because it is still a flourishing industry on the Great Lakes.

Then the hon. member brought up the question of the matters raised in *Hansard* in the federal House, and the remarks made by a Conservative member in relation to what he thought of a certain individual who was head of one of my departments. I am the person responsible for having Dr. Harkness appointed to his high office, and to the

type of research which is being carried on by an international committee. I must say that I accept full responsibility for it, and I am sure I am right in doing so.

Next I would like to read into the record one of the letters an hon. member of the federal House received from a body of people, who probably have a great deal to do with the election of hon. members to the House. I am sure the hon. member must be very much disillusioned since he made that statement. May I read this letter? It is written to me on behalf of Dr. W. J. K. Harkness and is a copy of a letter sent to Mr. J. W. Murphy, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR SIR:

We have recently noted your remarks on the efforts to eradicate the sea lamprey in Great Lakes waters, and are quite in accord with your statement, except your remarks about Dr. W. J. K. Harkness.

Dr. Harkness is recognized throughout the length and breadth of North America as an authority on fisheries research, and has been voted many high honours by his colleagues in biology and research. He was chosen the head of the Fish and Wildlife Division, of The Department of Lands and Forests, only after much study by the Honourable W. E. Thompson, the then Minister of Lands and Forests, of Ontario.

Since assuming this position Dr. Harkness has built up the finest wildlife management programme of any province in Canada. We, as an organization, have every faith in his knowledge and ability.

We certainly feel that nowhere in Canada could they have found a better man to represent Ontario and Canada as a member of the International Fishery Commission. We think your remarks regarding his fitness to serve on this commission demand a public apology. We can find nowhere in your political background where you could be considered an expert or in a position to judge a man of Dr. Harkness' calibre and talent.

If your remarks are sincere and not just voiced for political reasons, you might institute a Bill in the House giving sufficient financial assistance as to assure continued research on the lamprey problem. Constructive criticism is always welcome, vilification never.

Trusting to see your apology in print in the very near future, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

THE ONTARIO FEDERATION OF  
ANGLERS & HUNTERS INC.  
(signed) H. VIV SUTTON,  
Secretary-Manager.

I have others here in much the same vein, but I wanted the hon. member for Bruce, and other hon. members to know that the appointment of Dr. Harkness was made in good faith, and we think we have the right man.

That is why I extended the invitation to the newly-elected hon. members to meet the heads of my department. I think, after discussing it with them, you will find they are not thinking politically but are thinking in terms of the betterment of Ontario.

MR. WHICHER: I hope the hon. Minister understands I made no criticism of Dr. Harkness.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I realize that. I realize you did not mean to be critical.

MR. YAREMKO: Then what did the hon. member achieve by the quotation?

MR. WHICHER: I wanted to show how hon. members opposite get along with each other.

HON. MR. PORTER: Be careful.

MR. YAREMKO: With which side does the hon. member agree?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Further on in the remarks, the hon. member said in his speech:

When I was home over the weekend, I was going to go to the fish house, and bring down a lamprey eel. I do not know whether or not that is within the rules of the House, but I was going to bring it down, so you could see it. Probably 80 per cent. of you have seen one, but, on the other hand, perhaps some of you have not.

I have a lamprey eel here in the House and I want the hon. member to have a look at it. If the page boy would deliver it to the hon. member for Bruce, I think he will appreciate it.

MR. WHICHER: I can assure the hon. Minister I have seen hundreds of them.

HON. MR. PORTER: Did the hon. member ever try to eat one?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Continuing with the remarks appearing in *Hansard*, the hon. member quoted a statement of Mr. Murphy, in which he is purported to have said:

In the meantime, the trout fishing industry is being eliminated and the fishermen are going broke. In my end of Lake Huron, some of the fishermen are not even going to set out their nets in the spring.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point here, I want to point out that statement is entirely untrue, because there have been no fishermen in the southern part of Lake Huron who are fishing only for lake trout. Naturally, they get what they can, and to say they are not going to set their nets because of the lake trout is not true, and that is part of Mr. Murphy's statement in the House. So much for that.

I thought it might be interesting to the House to get some idea of what actually is going on in the game and fisheries department in Ontario, and know some of the history. I have some figures here and I think it would be best to quote them from a memorandum, because they are difficult to remember.

"The records of commercial fishing in Ontario start about 1869, and in the period since those first records to the present there has been wide fluctuation in poundage, value and men engaged in the fishery.

"The all-time greatest recorded catch was in the two years, 1953 and 1954, in which two years the poundage and values were:

|      |                 |                    |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1953 | 44,838,572 lbs. | \$7,037,000 value. |
| 1954 | 47,678,903 lbs. | \$7,013,000 value. |

The catch of the greatest monetary value was in 1952 with a value of \$7,417,000.

"Going back some years the catch in 1917 and 1918 was of outstanding significance:

|      |                 |                    |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1917 | 42,231,000 lbs. | \$2,866,000 value. |
| 1918 | 46,002,000 lbs. | \$3,175,000 value. |

"Since 1910 the number of men engaged in the primary work of fishing has varied between 3,336 in 1942 to 4,440 in 1937, with 3,657 to 4,000 being employed over the last 10 years.

"The fish of greatest value are whitefish, blue and yellow pickerel, perch, lake herring which include 'chub,' 'cisco,' 'tullibee,' 'bluefin,' 'nlues,' and 'bloats,' and before the lamprey made its inroads, the lake trout.

"Lake Erie is by far the most productive of all of the Great Lakes."

Incidentally, in speaking of Lake Erie, where many lake trout are caught; the catches are primarily of perch, pickerel and white fish. The anglers are interested in where they will be able to catch the most fish and collect the most money. Lake Erie has probably more peculiarities than any other lake in our system.

Oddly enough, back in the 1920's, the eels or lampreys first started in Lake Ontario, and a few made their appearance in Lake Erie. We had never had any trouble with the eels in Lake Erie. The reason for that is because of the nature of the spawning beds. The type of water does not lend itself to the lamprey. Therefore we find the lamprey in its travels over the Great Lakes started in Ontario, going very quickly through Lake Erie, and settling in the 1930's and 1940's in Georgian Bay, and in 1947 and 1948 going into Lake Superior. Consequently, Lake Erie has not been affected by the lamprey, and the fishing in that lake is still showing tremendous results.

"During the early years of this century, Ontario accepted increasing responsibility for the fisheries. Ontario constructed game fish hatcheries and commercial fish hatcheries and finally in 1926 the Federal Government transferred all its hatcheries to the province.

"At the present time Ontario administers the fisheries of the province under the authority of the Fishery Regulations for the Province of Ontario through authority of the regulations section of The Fisheries Act, Canada."



May I say here, I would like to clear up a point of misunderstanding with regards to hatcheries. Most laymen, including myself, were very much interested in finding out that our department officials believe that hatcheries, and particularly the hatcheries in Lake Huron have not contributed too much to the lake fishing in the province.

The original thinking regarding the hatcheries system, when it was first initiated by the Federal Government and turned over later to the Provincial Government, was that the hatchery people would go to the fishing vessels, collect the spawn, take it to the hatcheries and there rear fish. This has been done for many years.

When the statement made by Mr. Murphy that Dr. Harkness referred to the hatcheries as "like spitting in the ocean," I think he was referring to a situation which has developed—and has been recognized by the fishermen themselves—that the hatcheries have not contributed too much to the Great Lakes fishing, but they do contribute a tremendous amount to our inland lakes system.

The situation is this, and I think it will bear some going over. It is a very interesting situation. The history of the hatcheries, as I said, has been very much misunderstood by the laymen generally. When I came into the department I felt because we did not have enough hatcheries this was probably the reason why we did not have enough fish in our lakes.

"In considering the use of hatcheries for stocking the Great Lakes with commercial fish, it is well to realize that nature has been looking after the supply of fish in our lakes for many centuries, and has brought to a high degree of perfection the spawning beds selected by such fish as pickerel and whitefish for depositing the eggs. We can now think a little further to the time when fry is hatching within these eggs, which brings us to the realization that the eggs have been placed in those areas of a lake where the tiny food is present in large quantities on which the small fish

fry have to depend for food after they hatch.

"We can at the same time think in terms of large schools of fish, such as pickerel, the families of which deposit some 40,000 to 60,000 eggs apiece, and when we multiply that by the number of fish in a spawning school it soon adds up to not only millions but many hundreds of millions of eggs from which the fry are hatching in their natural food-producing areas.

"As compared with this, the capacities of our hatcheries are limited to a few hundred thousand or in some cases, a few millions of eggs, of which admittedly, we have a successful hatch generally in the order of 50 to 80 per cent. of those brought in which is only a minute fraction of even a small natural lake spawning production.

"Now when we come to release these tiny fish fry into the lake, we can only guess at whether there is a supply of natural food and whether the water temperature and other conditions for the younger fish to survive and grow are satisfactory. We are competing here with nature, who has learned by experience, and in our case we are only making the best possible guess which we know from experience, in many cases, is a very poor second.

"This illustrates the unsatisfactory condition of hoping that our hatcheries will do much of anything to increase natural populations of such fish as whitefish and pickerel when they are present in our Great Lakes in goodly numbers.

"This in no way depreciates the value of hatcheries for rearing such fish as trout to larger size before stocking them in our lakes and streams, or for the use of hatchery raised fish to stock new waters with a particular species for which purposes our hatcheries have a very high value for fish management programmes."

As far as we are concerned, in The Department of Lands and Forests, it has been successful in the small inland lakes, and particularly in the lakes where there were no fish, because we

are enabled now to see the results. When the hon. members consider the magnitude of the Great Lakes, and try to apply the principles of the hatcheries and so forth, it is a different thing, and I think that is the matter to which Dr. Harkness was referring.

MR. C. E. JANES (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, since I have been here, may I say that Dr. Harkness has gone down to meet the fishermen on the lakes every two years, and they are very happy about his coming. The Sarnia Fish Hatchery is closed at the present time by agreement with the fishermen of Lake Huron. Last year, I think there were about one-third more fish put into Lake Huron than the year before.

The hatchery at Sarnia was put out of business by the storm, and while there has been some consideration of replacing, it is realized it will take a great deal of money to repair it. That is the situation at the present time. I can assure the hon. members that the fishermen are very happy at the work done by Dr. Harkness.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Referring to the record of the amount of fish taken in Georgian Bay, for instance—and this will interest the hon. member for Bruce—I can go back over many years. We have the records back to 1841—and they are very complete—of the different species, and, in some cases, the value of the fish.

I think that when the statement is made that the “fishing was null and void,” reference should be made to the fact that there were 3,692,000 whitefish, 154,000 lake trout, and 107,000 pickerel taken in the Georgian Bay area in one year. In Lake Huron as a whole, without the Georgian Bay—and that is going back over a 10-year period—I would like to quote the figures for Lake Huron for the 10-year period as an illustration—in 1944, there were 142,555 whitefish, 315,828 lake trout, and 154,480 yellow pickerel.

In 1953—and I would like hon. members to pay particular attention to the second figure, because I think it is very

significant—there were 179,742 whitefish, only 204 recorded trout taken in Lake Huron, and 231,000 yellow pickerel. The over-all value for 1954, for instance, was well over \$250,000, but hon. members will note the fall-off from 1944 was well over 300,000 lake trout.

There are many people in my department, including Dr. Harkness, with whom I have discussed this matter very thoroughly, who just cannot believe that the lamprey eel, or any other parasite, could be responsible for that terrific reduction in the fish population in a large area like Lake Huron.

We still have people in the fishing industry, as perhaps some of the hon. members know, who will tell you the lakes are being over-fished. That might be worthy of some belief, because with the terrific increase in population, more and more people are going into that line of business, and perhaps our lakes may be to some extent over-fished, but it is significant to note the terrific destruction of lake trout, causing a reduction in catch in Lake Huron, from 350,000 to 250 or less, in a 10-year period.

I would like to say a few words about the lamprey eel, and what we are trying to do to control it. You have seen a specimen, and it is not a very beautiful water fish.

I have had the privilege of fishing in Lake Superior for lake trout, and I have caught lake trout with eels attached to them, and I would say that in the Lake Superior area, in the commercial and sport fishing areas, probably one out of every 3 fish caught show some marks from the lamprey eel. The lamprey eel was first seen in Lake Superior only back as far as 1946, so within this 6 or 7 year period, you have this tremendous inroad on our fish in Lake Superior.

“The lamprey is an elongate eel-like animal with a sucking disk armed with teeth as a mouth but with no jaws.

“It lives as a parasite by sucking the blood of its victim which is generally a fish and by preference one with no scales

or with small soft scales like the lake trout.

"There are several kinds of lampreys native to our lakes and streams but they are all smaller than the sea lamprey and not dangerous to our fishery.

"The sea lamprey is a native of the ocean and streams flowing into the ocean. Although it does kill fishes, it is not so serious there as in our inland lakes. In the Baltic countries it is fished for and used as a food, being considered a delicacy.

"The time of its entrance into Lake Ontario is not known. The rapids of the St. Lawrence River would not impede its progress, so it may have been present in Lake Ontario for many years.

"It undoubtedly gained access to the upper Great Lakes by way of the Welland Canal.

"The first recorded sea lamprey from Lake Erie was taken at Merlin in 1921, although it has never been able up to the present to establish itself in great numbers in Lake Erie. But once it reached Lake Huron its spread and increase in abundance was rapid. The lamprey was well established in Lake Huron and doing considerable damage to the lake trout before 1940.

"In Lake Superior the first recorded specimen taken was at Isle Royale in 1946, and already it is well established over a good area of the lake and it is making inroads into the lake trout fishery."

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. members that I think this is very significant:

"There are some people who still believe that the falling off to complete disappearance of the lake trout in Lake Huron, Lake Michigan and now in Lake Superior is the result of over-fishing or some other causes than the lampreys. But the close relation between the increase in abundance of the lamprey and the destruction of the lake trout and the increase of lamprey scars on lake trout which are taken, give a very clear pic-

ture of the lamprey being the cause of the lake trout decline.

"The lamprey runs up streams to spawn in the spring and there is evidence to indicate that it will not spawn if the water in the stream is too cold. This, we hope, may be a deterrent to its spawning in the cold water streams on the north shore of Lake Superior.

"The lamprey builds a nest of coarse gravel, rubble or stones and the eggs are fertilized and deposited in these nests with an average production of eggs by each lamprey of as much as 60,000 to 100,000 eggs. It is generally believed that the lamprey spawns only once and then dies, and that if it is in water which is unfavourable for spawning and it does not spawn or spawn successfully, it will die.

"It is not known, however, how long they will go on living if they cannot spawn in the regular season, as we have taken lamprey from the spawning run which have lived through the summer and been in our tanks at the Canadian National Exhibition in the fall.

"The lamprey eggs hatch in from 10 to 12 days and the young or larva lamprey drift downstream until they reach mud beds where they establish themselves by burrowing into the mud with their mouths at the opening of the burrow, sucking in food that drifts downstream past them. During the stream life the young lamprey are completely harmless.

"They may live in the mud beds of the stream or adjacent areas of the lake for a period of 4 years, after which they transform into the adult larva, which at that stage is generally about 7 inches long.

"The adult sea lamprey may live in the open waters of the lake for a year and a half or more, during which time it feeds parasitically on the fishes in the lake. It is believed that in the lakes it generally lives in the deeper waters coming shorewards in the fall and winter before going up the streams to spawn.

"This knowledge of the life history is important in helping us to determine



the best chances of attacking the lamprey for control purposes, and this suggests that if they can be destroyed when going upstream to their spawning beds, it serves the purpose of attacking them when they are concentrated and just before they have carried out their production of a new crop of lamprey.

"This is the basis for the establishment of trap weirs to catch lampreys as they are ascending the streams and of the installation of electrical barriers to prevent them from getting into their spawning beds in the streams. These spawning lamprey run in size from 16 to 17 inches to a maximum of two feet or a little over.

"In 1946, the Province of Ontario, in conjunction with the representatives of the fisheries departments of the States contiguous to the Great Lakes and the United States Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, set up informal committees to study the lake trout and work out methods of lamprey control and maintenance and re-establishment of lake trout populations in the Great Lakes.

"This led to a programme of installation of traps to capture the lampreys which have been operated continuously each spring by the Province of Ontario on streams flowing in the North Channel and Lake Huron and latterly Lake Ontario, with a total capture of lampreys in the order of 71,200. The Ontario expenditure for this work was in the order of \$115,189, or an average yearly expenditure of something in the order of \$8,000, plus personnel and other services.

"Concurrently with the work on lamprey a great deal of work was being done in connection with lake trout fish hatcheries in the rearing of lake trout and raising them to yearling size and releasing them in key areas throughout Lake Ontario, Lake Huron and Lake Superior. A high percentage of the lake trout which were released both in Ontario and the American side of the Great Lakes were marked, so that their recovery could be recorded and so provide a measure of the efficiency of plant-

ing lake trout of various sizes and under various conditions.

"These experiments on the planting of lake trout in the Great Lakes demonstrated to our satisfaction that the stocking of lake trout in the Great Lakes was successful to a degree and that the stocking with yearling trout was definitely more successful than the stocking of fingerlings.

"The use of hatchery reared stock of young lake trout, particularly when carried to the yearling stage, is contemplated as a definite phase in the programme for maintaining and re-establishing lake trout in Lake Superior and Lake Huron including Georgian Bay when it is possible to bring the lamprey under control.

"During the early work on lamprey control and lake trout culture in the upper Great Lakes, the federal Department of Fisheries, Ottawa, was currently advised of all activities and invited to participate in the informal Lake Trout and Lamprey State-Provincial Committee meetings, and it was drawn to the attention of the federal Department of Fisheries, Ottawa, that on the American side of the Great Lakes the United States Federal Fish and Wildlife Service was playing the leading role in the study of the lamprey and its control.

"In April, 1953, a joint committee was set up with members appointed by the federal Department of Fisheries and the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests to give special consideration to the control of the lamprey in Lake Superior and research in all of the Great Lakes in general. The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests appointed to the committee: Mr. F. A. MacDougall, Dr. W. J. K. Harkness, Mr. R. N. Johnston and Dr. F. E. J. Fry. The federal Department of Fisheries appointed Mr. Stewart Bates, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. George Clark, Dr. A. L. Pritchard and Dr. W. M. Sprules. The committee named Dr. Fry and Dr. Sprules to direct the field operations.

"The Federal Government in 1953 provided \$65,000, in 1954 \$176,000 and in 1955, \$355,000.

"During 1953, preliminary investigations were carried out on the east and north shores of Lake Superior and 3 electrical barriers and some dams were erected on a trial and experimental basis.

"In 1954, the installation of electrical and log barriers was extended to many other streams. (Log barriers are used in smaller streams where they will not be carried out by the floods, the electrical barriers are used in the larger streams as they are planned for the purpose of passing floods and logs without interference in their operation).

"During 1954, extensive investigations of practically all of the Ontario streams flowing into Lake Superior was carried out to determine the presence of lamprey spawning beds. This work was facilitated by the use of helicopters and crews totalling over 75 men made up largely of personnel of The Department of Lands and Forests field staff working from aircraft, boats and from the shore.

"In 1955, there were 25 electrical barriers in operation to block the streams to spawning lamprey with 6 more under construction and 72 check wires to determine whether or not these streams were being used by lamprey to spawn.

"There is a liaison maintained with the workers on the American side of Lake Superior and the other lakes and their programme parallels or is slightly in advance of the Canadian work."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest inroads into our fisheries is done in the spawning season, when the lampreys are going upstream.

I could go on at great length speaking about the lamprey eels, but I would like to tell the hon. members that we are constantly "on the job", but I do not think anybody in Canada, or in the United States, as a matter of fact, knows what to do about them. We have spent a great deal of money, and we plan to spend considerable more.

I am glad to say that we have finally interested our fisheries in the matter, and they are coming into it with us, and we have an international commission of which Dr. Harkness is a member, representing Canada, with one or two others, and we feel now we have some idea of what we are doing, and I believe our future activities will depend largely on the amount of money we will be permitted to spend.

The problems are terrific, as I am sure all hon. members will agree, and it would be foolish indeed for me to say that we have all the answers to the problem, but we are trying to do something about it, and I thought it might be well today to draw to the attention of the hon. members, and to people outside who are concerned with the fishing industry, to the fact that we still have fishing going on in Lake Ontario in the northern section of the lake. The southern part is completely "washed out". Lake Huron has had difficulty with the lake trout, as I have shown.

Lake Superior has always been a great sporting lake. For many years it was nothing for a fisherman to go out, during the fall of the year and come back with a 35 or 40 pound lake trout, caught just by trolling.

However, the fishing has been bad in my riding during the last few years, and one thing about which we are greatly concerned is the Rockport Fish Derby, which has been admitted to be one of the greatest sporting events in the province. I might say just a word about it.

This fish derby was inaugurated in a little fishing village on the north shore of Lake Superior, having a population of probably 100. On the Sunday when the derby takes place, there may be upward of as many as 5,000 people there. They come from the United States and Canada, and use any kind of boat available, from a 6-foot punt to a cruiser. Everybody goes out at the same time, and they have to be back at a certain time at night, and have the fish weighed, and the winners are then announced.

The prizes are well worthwhile winning. I think last year one of the prizes was a trip to Bermuda for two weeks for the winner and his wife, and another won a trip to Florida. It has been a very popular event in the Lakehead area, and, as a matter of fact, all across the province, and we do not like to think events like that could be disrupted, and the livelihood of so many of our people so badly damaged by these parasites.

May I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we are working on it, and we think we now have some idea of what we are doing, and have spent vast sums of money, in connection with the Federal Government, in an effort to counteract this parasite, and we hope that before very long we can bring in a report that we have been able to eradicate this great menace to the fishing in our lakes.

MR. R. E. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister one question?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Certainly.

MR. ELLIOTT: I understood the hon. Minister to say that some kind of poison has been developed which will destroy them. Is that true?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I do not know of any. The only way, we think, is to trap them by the use of these electrically-wired weirs.

MR. D. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, on two occasions the hon. Minister referred to "vast sums of money." May I ask if he will translate the word "vast" into some relative figure?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Last year we received from the Federal Government about \$350,000 for use in connection with the problem of the sea lampreys, and in addition, this province has spent \$75,000 or \$80,000.

MR. A. J. CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the

motion on their well-prepared and well-thought-out speeches.

I would also like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your appointment to your high office at this session of the Legislature.

I would be remiss in my duties, both as a member of the Legislature and a citizen of this province, if I did not make some comment on the recently-appointed Attorney-General's safety crusade. His campaign has the whole-hearted support of the people it is my honour to represent in the riding of Wentworth and I am sure that of every law abiding citizen in this province as well.

The hon. Attorney-General's crusade has already shown very encouraging results in the reduction of fatalities on the provincial highways, and I am quite confident that the goal of 50 per cent. reduction in fatalities, set by the hon. Attorney-General, will be reached by the end of 1956.

The results of fatalities since the 50 miles-per-hour speed limit has been rigidly enforced disproves statements made by the automobile industry that horse-power and speed are not major contributing factors to an ever-increasing orgy of mass murder. Since we have now proven by results the hazards of speed on our highways, I would respectfully suggest again, as I have done many times in the past, that this government look into the matter of controlling horse-power in automobiles licenced to operate in this province.

I realize we cannot tell the automobile industry what they can or cannot manufacture or how much horse-power they can put under the hood of an automobile. But I do believe it is within the power of this Assembly to say what vehicles may be licenced to operate on our highways, and I suggest we should exercise that power and refuse to licence high-powered cars that are a danger and a menace. This horse-power rat race put on by the automobile industry to sell cars can add nothing except additional fatalities and injuries to our already sad record of highway accidents.



Only last week I spoke to the owner of a large automobile agency in Hamilton where I was considering purchasing a new car, and when I asked what the advantage was of the 8 cylinder model over the 6, he replied "additional horse-power." He said: "you can get rapid acceleration and can get up to 60 and 75 miles per hour in the matter of a few seconds."

The automobile industry is very much like the siren Loreli who tempted sailors and led them to their death. The automobile industry tempts its prospective purchasers of automobiles with sales talks of high-powered cars, which will lead them—as did Loreli—to death and destruction.

Their high-powered advertising today is based on increased horse-power. A few years ago the horse-power in cars was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 80 and 90; today, with the speed limit the same, they are now advertising cars with 305 horse-power. They point out that you can now have jet take-off, catapult starts, and race-track get-away, if you buy this or that particular car. The television advertisements show cars racing up Pike's Peak in a manner which should be sufficient to commit the driver to a mental hospital.

One company boasts that its standard car has been picked as the pace-setter for the famous Indianapolis Speedway, and that the standard car will hit a top speed of 110 miles per hour. Another company shows pictures encouraging you to take chances in passing trucks and buses, because you now have more horse-power under the hood.

One point the automobile industry is reluctant to tell the prospective customer, when trying to sell a high-powered car, is that a high compression motor today must be driven at high speeds exceeding the 50 miles per hour speed limit if he is to obtain maximum efficiency from his motor. If you slow these high compression motors to speeds of 50 miles per hour or less, engine trouble will develop. The fast valving and timing will tend to make the motor rough, when it idles, and it becomes sluggish on long runs. These motors

must be driven at least part of the time at high speed, if the purpose for which they were built is to be attained.

This is because of the prefring and compression losses. Such an engine is not suited for heavy pulling at low speeds. In short, Mr. Speaker, it tends to foul up and I have heard of cases where cars have been taken into garages for a motor tune-up because they were sluggish, and the only attention required to put them in top running order was to have a mechanic road test them at 75 and 80 miles per hour, and for this the owner would receive a bill of \$15 or \$20.

Gasoline economy also tends to suffer because of the design for maximum horse-power, as I know, from practical experience, as I have a high compression motor myself, which, I may add, I am selling as soon as I can find a buyer. I suggest to the hon. members of this House the automobile industry today is selling cars under false pretenses, knowing full well the high-compression motors are not efficient if they are continuously driven within the speed limit of 50 miles per hour.

The automobile is the number one killer and mutilator today, and will continue to be unless the industry itself takes some effective action to correct it, or the government restricts licences of vehicles which are considered too powerful or dangerous for highways. What we require from the auto industry is less horse-power and more horse-sense.

The automobile industry could be more aptly named "Murder Incorporated." It is more interested in selling cars than in saving lives, and when it comes to the decision of putting in a couple of extras in a car, one a selling "gimmick" and the other a safety feature, you can rest assured the selling "gimmick" gets the nod.

For the past 4 years I have been advocating the use of safety belts in automobiles. When they were suggested to the Automobile Chamber of Commerce before the Select Committee on Highway Safety that they should be made compulsory on all cars, we were told in no uncertain terms they were

definitely opposed to them. The safety engineers at General Motors told the committee, when we visited the General Motors Research Department and Proving Grounds, that safety belts would cause deaths, they were ridiculous unsightly straps.

Now, a little over a year later, at least one automobile manufacturer advertises safety belts as optional equipment. The source of their information on safety belts is the same as I have quoted for two years, which only goes to prove my previous statement that safety is only secondary as far as the manufacturer is concerned.

Last year, in October, the National Safety Council of America recommended the use of safety belts in all motor vehicles. Also practically all the leading medical associations and authorities in the United States have recommended the use of safety belts. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to read into the record part of an article reported in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*:

The public is not aroused only because automobile fatalities are accepted as "accidental" deaths. In reality, there is nothing "accidental" about them, except that they occur during automobile accidents.

Automobile accidents and automobile injuries are not synonymous terms, even though the two are chronologically related. The accidents may occur as the result of speed, inadequate highways, poor judgment or mechanical failure, but none of these actually causes the passenger injury.

The injury occurs primarily as a result of faulty interior design of the automobile. "Faulty" is actually a gross understatement, as there is almost no feature of the interior design of a car that provides for safety. The doors, seats, cushions, knobs, steering wheel, and even the overhead structure are so poorly constructed from the safety standpoint that it is surprising anyone escapes from an automobile accident without serious injury. The elimination of the mech-

anically hazardous features of interior construction would prevent approximately 75 per cent. of the fatalities, or 28,500 deaths each year.

Then they go on to say under a heading of "Structural Design and Prevention":

There is no doubt that the research engineering department of any one of the major automobile companies could offer design changes that would afford greater safety. In fact, the engineers have supplied valuable ideas, but these have been incorporated in present cars only to a limited degree. The reason is that the industry apparently is governed entirely by the cost accounting division. No new idea can be adopted unless it either reduces present costs or affords a sales aspect to offset additional expenditures.

The industry does not believe that safety is a sales incentive. However, safety is something we all understand and desire. It is the one feature of the future automobile that the public will accept if given the opportunity, without the need of propaganda and expensive advertising.

That is from an authoritative body representing the medical profession in the United States.

I believe the hon. Attorney-General will be pleased to know his safety campaign has been welcomed and accepted as part of a large business concern's public-relations policy. The Johnson Wax Company has also done a great deal of research on the value of safety belts. Their findings have convinced them to the extent that they are now pioneering the use of safety belts across Canada.

As you realize, Mr. Speaker, no company could afford to risk their good name unless they were convinced that good public relations would follow through the benefits of these safety belts. This company, while offering these belts at cost as a sales promotion feature, nevertheless have full confidence in their benefits to the driving public.

The hon. member from Brantford must feel quite proud of his Town of Brantford to have such a public-spirited company as Johnson Wax Company making such a worthy and worthwhile contribution to our highway injury and fatality problem.

I sincerely hope other companies in Ontario will follow this outstanding leadership and find other ways of promoting safety as part of their public-relations policy.

In British Columbia, Premier Bennett has pioneered the use of safety belts in that province by installing belts in all government automobiles. He is convinced that safety belts will save lives. His information on the merits of safety belts came from Cornell University, which has made extensive tests on safety belts, and the Indiana State Police, who have also been conducting a crash-survival survey.

There is at the present time sufficient proof available to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that safety belts can, if used, reduce the injuries and fatalities by as much as 50 per cent. Incidentally, there were two fatalities in January about which I recall reading in the newspapers, which would never have happened had the people worn safety belts. One—in the hon. Prime Minister's riding—when a boy fell out of a car when the door flew open, and another in the hon. Minister of Highways' riding when a woman was thrown out of the car when it crashed in a ditch.

I would respectfully suggest at this time that the hon. Prime Minister give very serious consideration to installing safety belts in all government-operated vehicles.

If the hon. Prime Minister is not convinced of the merits of safety belts, possibly he would then consider setting up a select committee to investigate safety belts and other devices for automobiles. Law enforcement alone is not the answer, nor for that matter are safety belts, but they can, if given the opportunity, play a major part in reducing fatalities and injuries. I would suggest that, between the enforcement

of the Highway Traffic Act and the introduction of safety belts in cars, we can reduce both fatalities and injuries by as much as 75 per cent.

If the automobile industry is sufficiently convinced to make safety belts optional then they must have made an investigation into their merits and since they have gone this far—somewhat reluctantly, I must say—why cannot we go all the way, and make them compulsory?

There is one other point that I would like to make at this time regarding dangerous equipment in automobiles, which I have made on other occasions, and that is, we should not permit cars to be licenced which have dangerous hood ornaments. Evidence was presented to the Select Committee on Highway Safety indicating that a hood ornament was responsible for the death of a child in the hon. Prime Minister's riding.

While I am on the subject of "safety" I would like to direct a few remarks and comments to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan). I have a great deal of respect for the hon. Minister, having had the pleasure of sitting with him on the Select Committee on Highway Safety before he was elevated to his present position, and I know of his keen interest in safety.

I realize his department embraces many phases dealing with our highways system, and it is possible to overlook some matters unless they are brought to his attention.

One of these deals with bumpers. It appears that this has been pigeon-holed as there are still hundreds of trucks without back bumpers. I would respectfully suggest that the Legislature should introduce, at this session, legislation to make it compulsory for all trucks to install bumpers both back and front.

I would recommend that the American Interstate Commerce Commission regulations be written into the legislation. Their bumpers are designed to keep low front ends of passenger vehicles from sliding under the high rear ends of trucks. The front bumper should



also come under the same type of regulation. There is no reason in the world why trucks cannot install bumpers below the regular front bumper which is, in most cases, attached to the high frame of the truck, so that the "auxiliary bumper"—if you like to call it that—would be at the same level as a car bumper.

While on the subject of trucks, there is still another problem with which we in Hamilton are having trouble, and that is the question of truck noises. In one of our hospitals, patients are kept awake at night because of trucks roaring and back-firing. If the trucks were re-routed, as some people have suggested, we would not be solving the problem but just shifting it to another location.

The crux of the problem lies with the present legislation. Our chief of police has remarked on a number of occasions that a lack of legally-defined "unnecessary noise" hampers his department in obtaining convictions.

Through the co-operation of the Hamilton *Spectator* and our radio station CKOC, we were able to conduct truck-noise tests on Hamilton streets with radio equipment to measure the sound of traffic noise in decibels, and with the co-operation of one of our more progressive trucking companies—the Norris Transport—we were able to conduct actual road tests with trucks equipped with new silent-type mufflers, and compare the noise from these trucks with other trucks and transports equipped with a regular type muffler.

The results were amazing. The instruments registered cement trucks, buses, and comparable transports at 125 decibels, compared with the transport with a new muffler with a reading of only 70 decibels. The results substantiate our previous thinking that at least a large part of the noise could be eliminated by the use of a proper-type muffler.

Working with our local medical officer of health, Dr. Clark, and our chief of police, Leonard Lawrence, we prevailed on the hon. Minister of Health to take some action and thanks to his co-opera-

tion we were able to have an extensive noise survey made at 4 locations in Hamilton.

Doctor L. B. Leopard, from The Department of Health, conducted the survey, using special high-sensitive equipment and tape recorders. The noises were recorded on tape machines so that they could be analyzed and a complete report filed.

The report is not complete but from the advance information I find that the special muffler used by Norris Transport was approximately 30 per cent. less noisy, and objectionable to the ear, than standard equipment mufflers on other transports.

It therefore looks in principle as if some improvement in traffic noise can be achieved. I would therefore ask the hon. Minister of Highways if he would study the report, when it is completed, with the thought of strengthening present legislation to improve the traffic noise situation with which we are faced.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations and remarks on a subject which has had considerable publicity in the past few months—the problem of sex deviates. We in Hamilton have had more than our share of sex crimes in the past few months, I believe it is 6 cases of rape, 10 of indecent assault and a number of others involving the molestation of young children. Last year we had an average of more than 4 sex crimes per week.

Hamilton has almost become a "city of fear," as far as our female population is concerned, with so many sex deviates at large, many of them having more than a passing acquaintance with the inside of penal institutions. It is not considered wise for women and children to be on the streets after dark. It has come to a disgraceful state of affairs when women are afraid to go out at night, and little children are afraid to speak to adults, but this is the condition which exists in Hamilton.

A petition with 5,000 names, signed by residents of Hamilton, which I presented to the hon. Attorney-General on February 1, was completed in less than

two weeks, and if we had continued for another two weeks, the petition asking for more adequate penalties and treatment for sex deviates could easily have been 50,000.

The citizens of Hamilton at large have raised the question as to where law-abiding people are protected from such criminals under the Criminal Code. We all realize it is a very complex problem, but I suggest it is not going to be solved as long as judges and magistrates sympathize with these sexual beasts and turn them loose. Any man who would ravish a young child or teen-age girl should be taken out of society for good, not just have his wrist slapped and put back into society to prey on more victims, which, unfortunately, has happened in some cases in the past.

Society is not particularly interested if one is put away for life in a mental hospital or a penitentiary, so long as he is out of circulation away from young children and women. For some of the minor sex offences it should be mandatory for a criminal to be held in detention, and treatment afforded, until such time as he can be released without being a danger to society. What is the sense of giving a man 30 to 60 days in jail, if, when he comes out, he starts his illegal sexual activities all over again?

There is a definite need for all those convicted of sexual offences to receive treatment while they are serving a sentence, and their sentence should not be judged only according to the sex crime he has committed, but rather to the length of treatment, or treatments, which are required to cure him.

Why should people with warped and dangerous minds be allowed on city streets to attack women and children whenever they get the impulse? You do not release sick people from hospital until they are cured; it seems only common sense that these people should also be retained until they are cured.

We all realize there is a great deal to be learned about the psychological aspect of sex deviation and perversion, but why, in the name of all decent people, do we allow known sex deviates to be

at large, when we know from past experience they are dangerous and will repeat their illegal activities? Does it not make more sense to lock them up until we have learned more about these matters, and provide them with whatever treatment we can?

I know this might sound harsh and unjust, but I think too much sympathy is being given to the criminal, and not enough to the little children who are being ravished. We all realize the Criminal Code is woefully weak, in many cases protecting the sex criminal rather than punishing him.

However, there is one section of the Criminal Code which deals with criminal sexual psychopaths which could be used in many more cases than is now the case. It enables a magistrate, under certain circumstances, to confine a sexual psychopath indefinitely, but the crux of the matter is that once he is put away, we do not have the special facilities needed to treat this type of criminal. I would suggest to the hon. members of this House that money should be made available to the hon. Minister of Health, and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, to build the type of facilities which are required to properly treat this type of criminal while he is being detained in our reform institutions.

I was rather amazed at a news item which reported Justice Minister Garson as saying "you cannot lock up all sex deviates." He said:

If one goes back through the history of music and literature, one will find that some of the great masterpieces in these fields have been written by sex deviates, and that in point of fact we are enormously indebted to them for what they have handed down to their fellow man.

Does hon. Mr. Garson suggest that special privileges be given to sex deviates that write music and literature and does he suggest that there is, or should be, a separate law for the rich deviates?

It would certainly seem to be so.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. member if he is quoting from his speech or Mr. Garson's?

MR. CHILD: I said the item was of a speech of the hon. Mr. Garson which appeared in the Press. I have the Press clipping if the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to have a look at it.

MR. OLIVER: I would like to see it.

MR. CHILD: I would be very happy to pass it over to the hon. leader of the Opposition afterwards. However, I would like to have it back because I might have a better use for it.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member can trust me to do that.

MR. CHILD: As long as there is that type of thinking in Ottawa, there is no wonder that so many sex deviates are at large today, molesting, viciously attacking, and criminally assaulting women and children.

If we are going to stamp out sex crimes we need stiffer laws, and magistrates and judges who will hand out the maximum sentences, not a token sentence with sympathy for the sex criminal.

The whole matter ties in directly with another problem with which we have all been faced for a number of years and that is the matter of salacious literature. Each year this type of literature becomes progressively worse.

The wording and pictures in magazines become more crude with each succeeding publication, and the amazing part is that there seems to be fewer convictions. The filth which is being published and made available to our youngsters has hit an all-time low. This would include crime comics, men's magazines and sex publications in general.

A few months ago I had high hopes of having a Bill introduced prohibiting the sale of any type of crime comic book which depicted horror, terror, brutality, gave accounts and methods of illicit sex—in general, all types of objectionable literature—to persons under the age of 18. Similar legislation has been introduced in the State of

Connecticut and, although it is published, it is restricted to the sale of adults.

Unfortunately, after conferring with the hon. Attorney-General, I was informed the Bill would be encroaching on the Criminal Code, and therefore could not be considered. So here we are, Mr. Speaker, right back where we started, with a scramble of useless words in the Criminal Code, which allows publishers and distributors of salacious and obscene literature to peddle it to our young Canadians. Is it any wonder we are in the midst of a sex deviate crime wave!

Sex crimes and salacious literature go hand-in-hand. Crime comics, sex books and other types of salacious literature foster sex crimes, and they are available for youngsters to buy in almost any drugstore or newsstand in every city, town and village in Canada. Between the ages of 8 and 16 the mind of a child is in the most absorbative condition. If the child's mind receives material having a good influence, that is the way we would like to have it, and the way it should be, but if the influence is bad, then we can only expect second-rate citizens in the future.

If our educators recommend the reading of books to influence our learning, then it must be accepted that good can be derived from reading good literature. Therefore, it is equally right to say that bad can be derived from reading filthy, obscene literature.

As a point of interest, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House one of the findings of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee set up to study publication of comic and sex books, in a report which was finalized, and printed in 1954. The finding is No. 6, and can be found on page 11 of the report, and is as follows:

The reading of crime comics stimulates sadistic and masochistic attitudes, and interferes with the normal development of sexual habits in children, and produces abnormal sexual tendencies in adolescents.



And when you add to these findings a statement made by chiefs of police who say that a recent FBI survey showed that these deviates degenerate from such minor offences as exhibitionism, loitering around school children and "peeping toms", to vicious acts of physical violence.

In November of last year I was speaking to a Parent-Teachers' Association meeting in Hamilton on the subject of "Crime Comics and Salacious Literature". A few days before I had picked up a book in a drugstore in the main section of Hamilton and on the cover it had the picture, in colour, of a very seductive nude woman, and in large letters at the top of the page, it had "Six ways to seduce a woman".

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong in the Province of Ontario when publishers and distributors are permitted to sell magazines of this type and can laugh at the law and continue to "rake in" their ill-gotten gains at the expense of our youngsters.

I travelled in a number of the capital cities of Europe before the war, where it is generally accepted their standard of morals is considerably lower than ours, and where houses of prostitution were legal and licenced to operate by the government. But in all my travels I never saw anything to compare with the sex books and obscene literature being sold on our newsstands throughout Canada today.

Mr. Speaker, we have "kicked" this matter of crime comics and sex books and other types of "muck" around long enough. I would respectfully suggest that all these types of publications should be studied by the Attorney-General's Department and that the hon. Attorney-General use his influence to have the matter of salacious literature put on the agenda of the Federal-Provincial Conference.

The future of Canada rests in the hands of our children. The progress of this country depends on how well we provide a sound education for our chil-

dren. I submit, Mr. Speaker, no sound foundation of education can be laid when young absorptive minds read crime comics and filthy obscene sex publications. This matter of comics, I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General, should have top priority on the agenda of the next Federal-Provincial Conference.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to make just a few remarks and observations regarding the statements made on February 9 by the hon. member for York South. The hon. member stated, as reported in *Hansard*, February 9, page 143:

Last year the Legislature spent some time discussing the question of a boy who committed suicide in Guelph. This was the lad who had been struck—and I ask the hon. members of this House to take a particular look at this—while in bed, incidentally, at Cobourg, and his nose broken. After he got home the hon. member for Wentworth took up his case and raised it with the department.

The last sentence, Mr. Speaker, is the only part of the statement by the hon. member for York South concerning the accident which is true. Certainly I took up the case. The boy's home was in my riding, and it was only natural when I learned of the incident, that I should make enquiries. I did ask for an investigation into the matter and I discussed it with the boy's family. The result of the investigation was, I am quite sure, satisfactory to all concerned, and it was brought out through the investigation that the boy broke his nose while escaping from Cobourg.

The hon. member for York South was not in any way, to my knowledge, connected with the investigation as was I.

MR. MacDONALD: That is not the case, incidentally.

MR. CHILD: It was what the investigation revealed, and it was what I had been discussing with the family. However, it seems the hon. member for

York South likes to be somewhat ghoulish, bringing this matter up, after the boy has died, which is a very unfortunate thing. I say to the hon. members of this House that his statement that "the boy's nose was broken in bed" is a complete falsehood, and that the hon. member for York South is a complete stranger to the truth.

Had the investigation revealed that the boy had his nose broken through rough handling at Cobourg, I would have been on the floor of this House criticizing the government in no uncertain terms, but my criticism would have been constructive rather than destructive.

May I at this time reply to the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition in his speech on February 7, when he said in effect that government members' main contribution is to say "Yes, Yes" and to clap when the government thinks they should clap. Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that remark. I have said it before—and will say it each time the hon. leader of the Opposition makes such an accusation. The member for Wentworth is no "Yes man" for anybody. I have no respect for one and I feel sure the hon. Prime Minister has not either.

My contribution here in the House has been to represent my constituents to their best advantage. That is exactly what I am trying to do, and will continue to do, and I challenge the hon. leader of the Opposition to prove otherwise. His statement may apply to government members in Ottawa, but it is definitely out of order in this Legislature.

And now, Mr. Speaker, returning to the statement by the hon. member for York South, concerning The Department of Reform Institutions, and the accident to the lad which broke his nose. The hon. member for York South has a very vivid imagination, and that is the only complimentary thing I can say about his speech. His personal attack on a civil servant has, I feel, brought politics to an all-time low in the history of this Legislature.

MR. D. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member if he has read the van Nostrand letter? That is the "all-time low."

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, at any rate, Dr. van Nostrand was a good psychiatrist.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario are not so certain about it, after reading the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CHILD: It is quite obvious that the hon. member for York South is like a bully at school, he can "dish it out," but when a civil servant turns on him, he cannot "take it."

I must admit I was naive when I came into the Assembly, but never, in my wildest imagination, did I ever think I would hear an elected member of this House stoop to attack a person who was not in a position to reply to his charges and accusations.

Mr. Speaker, if any man in sport attacked a defenceless player he would be ruled out of sport for life, and it is a pity that the same does not apply for politics. The hon. member's principles, I feel sure, do not apply to all members of the CCF Party, although the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn) has already shown he is an apt pupil of the leader of the CCF Party, and I would in the way of a suggestion recommend that he would be better advised to follow the principles of his other colleague, the hon. member for Ontario, whom I feel honoured to call "friend," and who, I believe, has the respect of all the hon. members of this House.

I am not criticizing the leader of the CCF Party for his opposition. That is his position, which should be carried to the full. My criticism is of the principle by which he has gone about it, in attacking a civil servant who was not in a position to reply.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CHILD: Very gladly. I will try and answer it.

MR. MacDONALD: Since the hon. member seems to have taken a particular interest in the case of the lad who committed suicide at Guelph, would he comment on the even more important point I raised, namely, that this boy was put into detention over the express warning, in the professional appraisal of his mental condition, that such action should not be taken? The professional appraisal indicated that the boy was so mentally disturbed that if he were placed in detention, he might attempt something desperate. In spite of that warning, he was placed in detention, and he committed suicide.

Here is a striking case of a conflict in philosophy within the department, the punitive appraisal predominating over the treatment approach, with tragic results. I would like the hon. member to comment on this.

HON. MR. PORTER: It sounds rather conflicting to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHILD: Mr. Speaker, I went to the reformatory at Guelph, secured the complete story. I was completely satisfied with the explanations given to me personally by the guards and by the superintendent, who said that such an occurrence might have happened at any time.

I am not one who would not stand up in my place and criticize the government if I thought it deserved it. But where credit is due, I am glad to give it, and I am perfectly willing to give the hon. member all the credit in the world for reducing politics in this House to an all-time low.

MR. A. FROST (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my sincere congratulations to you in respect to your advancement to the responsible position of the Speaker of our 25th session of our Legislature.

Also my congratulations to your assistant, our friend from Perth.

My congratulations also to the mover and seconder for the marvellous job they made in responding to the Speech from the Throne presented so ably by our Lieutenant-Governor.

We were all very happy to see the wonderful Conservative majority obtained in the election last June. It speaks very highly of the high position our capable, efficient and beloved hon. Prime Minister holds among the people of our large Province of Ontario. All the best members of this session are behind him wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate our member for Bellwoods for his able introduction of the old-age security raise, and others who have expressed their approval. They stressed every angle very well. I do not need to take up your time in repeating what the hon. members all heard. I am behind them and the hon. Prime Minister 100 per cent. in the old-age security raise to \$60 monthly.

I am also strongly behind our capable hon. Prime Minister in his endeavour to secure assistance for those whose health is impaired. Many people have had to mortgage their homes to pay enormous bills for sickness in their family, which generally is no fault of theirs.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no single subject which today gives more concern to our provincial and our municipal governments than that of transportation. In the United States this concern is likewise felt in the federal field. There, they not only have certain federal highways, but the various States are aided from the federal treasury according to need.

The government at Ottawa is not slow to follow Washington's example in many particulars; perhaps the American example could be followed in this field. We are quite aware of the modest, indeed grudging, aid extended by the Government of Canada to the Trans-Canada project, but this is no solution for our immediate problems.



*Metropolitan Area*

In no part of Ontario are traffic conditions more congested than in the Metropolitan area. This great area comprises 13 municipalities. Its population exceeds 1,250,000 people—one-fourth or more of the whole population of Ontario. The surface area is 239.7 square miles. It contains the greatest concentration of industry, trade and commerce in all Canada. It is the site of our Provincial Government. It is our greatest university centre.

I do not need to enlarge on our traffic problems because they are apparent to all of us. At this time, I think I should point out that our provincial administration has shown a practical awareness of these traffic problems and has done something constructive to help solve them.

*Toronto By-pass*

Let me first mention the interceptor road, the Toronto by-pass, essentially an important link in our great, new Trans-Ontario highway, No. 401. This by-pass, which will be opened in its entirety by next midsummer, will serve two major purposes.

First, it will take through traffic around our city rather than through our city streets. This will afford some real relief.

Secondly, it will take traffic entering the city to through streets, for example, Avenue Road, Bathurst Street, Dufferin Street, and so on. In a word, incoming traffic will be guided easily toward its point of destination.

Make no mistake about it, the Toronto interceptor road is one of Canada's greatest engineering works. There must be many members of this House who are not familiar with this great accomplishment. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) that they might consider chartering 3 or 4 buses to take the hon. members on a tour of this tremendous project.

*Humber Bridge*

I am happy to see that there is recognition on the part of the government of a provincial responsibility in another quarter. I refer to the construction of a huge and modern bridge at the Humber entrance to Toronto, to which I referred in a former address. Needless to say, this will eliminate one of the worst traffic bottlenecks in this Dominion. The western entrances to this area are not and never have been what they should be, and I am delighted at this particular note of progress.

*Municipal Grants*

The widening of North Yonge Street is another little-advertised project for which credit should go to the Department of Highways. Again, the City of Toronto, and the Metropolitan area generally are benefiting from the extension of municipal grants. Under a former government there was no recognition of road and street problems except as related to counties, townships and statute labour boards. It was left to this administration to correct this situation and to extend provincial grants to our cities, towns and incorporated villages.

Here is at least some relief to urban traffic conditions, and to urban taxpayers. But this does not solve our local problem.

*Toronto Subway*

Neither does the Toronto subway, which moves masses of people quickly and comfortably. It has taken the street cars off Yonge Street and made that artery a useful one for the motorist. If I recall correctly, the subway was estimated to cost about \$22 million. I understand that the actual cost was around \$60 million—something to give us food for thought when we speak about a "cross-town east-west subway."

*Commuter Services*

More than once I have stressed the need of adequate commuter services to serve this area, and indeed the surrounding countryside. The other day Mr.

Donald Gordon, president of the Canadian National Railways, declared that such services are unprofitable. He stated that to function efficiently, they must be subsidized from public funds. This is not a new point of view, for on many occasions the Canadian National Railway has found it necessary to be bailed out by the federal Treasury. The railways, here, and in the United States frown on commuter services, in fact on passenger traffic generally. This, however, is something I do not intend to argue about.

Let me point out this. One railway—not one of the large railways—handles 20,000 passengers every day out of the Boston area, and 30,000 out of the New York area, and remember, New York City is on an island, one of the most congested spots on earth. In rush hours, this particular railroad has a train checking in or out of the Grand Central Station every 90 seconds. Sometimes there are delays. The rolling stock is not always too good. But the people are being moved, quickly, safely and in reasonable comfort, to and from their homes.

#### *General Commuter Area*

East of Toronto we have such centres as Pickering, Ajax, Whitby, Oshawa, Cobourg and Port Hope. To the north we have Thornhill, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, Aurora, Agincourt, Uxbridge and other communities.

To the west and northwest we have Brampton, Port Credit, Oakville, Bronte, Cooksville and numerous other places, large and small. Every one of these places—and I could mention scores of others—is served by a railway. All too often the railway is a twin streak of rust, not earning its keep.

The existing commuter services to Oakville and Hamilton are helpful even if not adequate. To the north and east there is no commuter service at all.

Consider the people who work in this city and who live in the “dormitory suburbs”, so-called. It costs money to drive in. It costs them \$20 or \$25 a month for parking. To operate a car to get to and from work may well cost

\$75 or even \$100 a month. How much better it would be for these folks to park at some nearby suburban railway station, and come to town by rail quickly, safely and comfortably.

If the railways have not the lines to handle the extra equipment, their rights of way are usually wide enough for the installation of extra tracks. And again, I think they should be able to revise their equipment. Diesel-driven units, such as are used on the CPR Dayliners, might well be expanded or adapted for mass transportation.

As to the claim that the Union Station is not big enough to handle such increased traffic, I say, “nonsense.” There are many ways in which this objection could be successfully met.

I am satisfied, indeed, that for the suburban dweller a commuter service would cost him less than half as much as the operation of an automobile. I suggest this; that if a very heavy volume of traffic is immediately apparent, the railway managements should put their engineering and administrative ability to work not only to install these services, but also to make them pay. And if even one-third of the motor cars could be removed from our streets during rush hours, we should be going a long way toward solving a very acute traffic problem.

Commuter services, I suggest, might be investigated by the Select Committee on Toll Roads as constituting a related problem. If necessary, the terms of reference could well be broadened to permit research in this direction.

We have the people to support adequate commuter services. They are, I am sure, ready and willing to pay adequate fares.

Further, I should point out that the railways for decades have been the recipients of enormous land grants, and in the case of the Canadian National Railway, huge cash subsidies. No one will deny its importance to our economy. At the same time, they have a duty to all our people, namely, to bend their efforts to supply, not merely transportation, but adequate transportation. Gov-

ernments and railways should get their heads together, get rid of preconceived and ill-founded ideas, and see whether our great railway systems cannot expand the services I have suggested with profit to themselves and service to great and growing communities.

#### *Ontario Hospital—Toronto*

I should like to congratulate the administration, and more especially the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger) on the addition to the Ontario Hospital, Toronto. The magnificent and wholly modern building constructed on the front section of the property embodies a reception unit of 100 beds, special quarters for surgical and other essential services, and also new and commodious administration quarters, all of which features have long been needed.

This great institution has served this city well for more than 100 years. The grounds are sadly depleted but enough of the original acreage remains to serve as an adequate setting. I know the modern tendency is to build institutions out in the open country, but still a hospital like "999"—as it is commonly called—has its points. Its location makes it easy for friends and relatives to visit the patients. Also, it helps meet the staff problem, for it is not always easy to secure staff at institutions remotely located and perhaps not too well served by transportation.

I gather that it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Health to hold a formal opening of the new unit I have mentioned. I think it would be in order to hold this ceremony, if possible, while this House is in session. It would be a pleasant and enlightening experience for a good number of the hon. members to not only attend the ceremony, but also to see at first hand something of the workings of a modern and efficient mental hospital.

#### *Port Arthur and North Bay Hospitals*

It is gratifying to be able to point out that the new mental hospital at Port Arthur is now functioning. This new

institution, I believe, can presently accommodate 800 patients and when fully completed will have room for 1,200. I think the hon. members will also be interested in noting that work is well advanced on another new mental hospital at North Bay, this being essentially a duplicate of the Port Arthur institution.

Thus, at long last, northern Ontario is provided with facilities long overdue. Heretofore, northern patients have, of necessity, had to be brought to the excellent hospital at New Toronto, involving very long travel distances. It would be fair to assume that presently the facilities of the New Toronto Hospital will be more readily available to the people of this area.

#### *Ontario Hospital Staffs*

The Ontario hospitals have provided services, and have been of assistance otherwise under unusual circumstances in the past few years. Since the end of World War II, Canada has had a considerable influx of immigration from European countries, and about 60 per cent. of these people come to Ontario. And we welcome them. There are about 1,000 of them in the riding I have the honour to represent. I have met nearly all of them; I have visited in most of their homes, and I have found them sterling citizens whom I am most happy to number among my friends.

Many of these people arrive with limited means. Many of them meet with language difficulties, which, I may add, they are quick to overcome. And very many of them have found employment in our mental hospitals. A good many of them take naturally to this type of work. Their numbers include doctors, lawyers, nurses, dentists and other professional people. They are performing useful and valuable work in our hospitals; many of them, in due course, being able to establish themselves in their professions here, after meeting the usual requirements. This process has been a great asset to the mental hospitals and to very many of our new Canadians. I think they are highly deserving of this modest tribute.



*Nurses-in-Training*

I was very glad indeed to see the recent public interest evoked in the proposal to give a "new deal" to nurses-in-training in our general hospitals.

I think it should be recorded that the Ontario hospitals have for very many years recognized the need for some reasonable scale of remuneration for student nurses. In the training schools attached to a number of our mental institutions, the student nurses are paid \$35 a month during the first year, \$40 a month when they are taking their affiliated courses in general hospitals, and \$50 a month in the final year. They also get free board, lodging, laundry and uniforms. Training schools are operated at 3 mental hospitals, namely Brockville, Kingston and Whitby. There are about 120 student nurses at the 3 hospitals.

It is realized, of course, that our general hospitals are non-profit organizations. Most of them find it difficult to make ends meet in spite of various forms of public assistance. But there are two angles, among many, which deserve consideration.

First, there is a chronic, and I think, an increasing shortage of trained nursing personnel. Hence, the profession must be made, shall I say, more attractive.

Second, many of the student nurses come from families of limited means. And let it not be forgotten that they do a tremendous amount of work which otherwise would have to be done by paid help.

Under all these circumstances I think it right and proper that there is arising a healthy and growing public interest in this matter. I am sure that the hon.

Minister of Health will not quarrel with my suggestion that the Administration should take some practical cognizance of this problem. I am equally sure the hon. members of the House will support any reasonable measures, first, toward attracting more young women into the nursing profession, and, secondly, toward eliminating the financial obstacles which all too often deter likely young women from entering the noblest of professions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate the many newly-elected members of our Legislature. I know they will all render very able and useful assistance and I know all the former members will make them feel very much at home.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. D. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that on Monday we shall proceed with second readings of the following Bills: Nos. 56, 58, 60, 72, 74 and possibly 96 if the hon. Prime Minister wishes to go on with it. Those appear on today's Order paper as Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 and 35. We shall also proceed with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and any other business which may be on the Order paper.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:00 p.m. of the clock.



# Legislature of Ontario

## Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Monday, February 20, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Monday, February 20, 1956**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Presentation of report, Mr. Dunbar .....</b>  | <b>340</b> |
| <b>Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, Bill to establish,<br/>    Mr. Dunlop, second reading .....</b> | <b>340</b> |
| <b>Mining Act, (90), Bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, second reading .....</b>  | <b>355</b> |
| <b>Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Macaulay .....</b>  | <b>368</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Macaulay, agreed to .....</b>   | <b>372</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....</b>   | <b>372</b> |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted briefly to refer to the fact that the week of February 19 to 26 is Brotherhood Week. It has always been the custom to mention this particular week at this time, not in a perfunctory way at all, but in the hope that this great movement, which is sponsored by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, will receive not only wide recognition here during this week in Ontario but also throughout Canada, and by the peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this week is heavily underscored in these days of great international danger. By reason of scientific research, men are now being given scientific weapons of great power capable of widespread death and destruction, something which concerns us all, as it affects the very future of the human race.

Mr. Speaker, the most obvious and apparent cure for this sort of thing lies

with people themselves, in human personalities and in the wide tolerance and understanding amongst the peoples of the world.

On this occasion, as on others, I have a great deal of pleasure in mentioning Brotherhood Week. I express the hope that the principles upon which the week is founded will continue to spread, so that 1956 may witness further progress in the great work of understanding as between peoples of different races, colours and creeds throughout the whole world.

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the hon. Prime Minister in the words he has expressed this afternoon, at the beginning of Brotherhood Week. As is known to all hon. members of this House, my riding and the riding of St. Andrew are perhaps the most cosmopolitan sections of the Dominion of Canada. If the hon. members of this House were to walk along Bathurst or Queen Streets in the heart of my riding they would hear many tongues.

I commend to the reading of the hon. members of this Legislature the editorial in today's *Telegram*. It refers to the gathering of all those Canadians, as musical themes, for the avowed purpose of producing a harmonious symphony. That is the harmonious symphony which I hear almost every day of the week at the corner of Queen and Bathurst Streets.

Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to attend, with the hon. Attorney-General, a gathering of the

Italian Immigrant Aid Society, which is doing a tremendous job in fitting Canadians of Italian origin into our way of life.

Yesterday afternoon I had the pleasure of being before some 1,600 Canadians of Lithuanian origin. Next Sunday it will be my pleasure to attend before the same number of Canadians of Esthonian origin. Therefore, this week highlights the way in which life is going on in Canada and in Ontario.

It is interesting to note that when this principle was first brought into the public eye, both in the United States and Canada, it was celebrated by the holding of Brotherhood Day. That has been expanded now into a dynamic Brotherhood Week.

I join with the wish of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, and indeed with the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada — who expressed the same thought — that we may all live in a country where brotherhood is the theme of our way of life, each day in every year.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): I would like to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed here. It seems to me that Brotherhood Week is an occasion on which we should not only express these sentiments but an occasion on which we should "take a look" at some of the rather striking evasions of those sentiments, which are apparent day in and day out.

I see one of the hon. Cabinet Ministers shaking his head, as if he were hoping to make the comment that "this is my evil mind again." I want to give one example which I have here of something which has relation to the university.

I draw this to the particular attention of the hon. Minister of Education. It is an application form for the Leonard Foundation, which is one of the extensive range of scholarships available in our universities in the Province of Ontario. Here on the front is a quotation from the official synopsis of the

Leonard Foundation Trust in accordance with which, presumably—since they still print it on their application form—they choose to give the scholarship. Let me read this.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is that the Foundation under which the Wells Scholarship is given?

MR. MacDONALD: I presume so, but I would not be certain. This is the quotation:

The underlying principles upon which the Leonard Foundation is based rest in the belief of the founders that the preservation and development of civilization along the best lines are primarily functions of the white race, that the progress of the world depends in the future as in the past upon the maintenance and spread of the Christian religion, and that the stability and prosperity of the British Empire are essential to the peace of the world and the continuance of civilization; and it is considered that the attainment of these objectives is promoted by the education in patriotic institutions of selected children of the white race, of the Christian religion in its Protestant form, and of British nationality, whose birth and training are such as to warrant a reasonable expectation of their developing into leading citizens of the Empire.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that I join whole-heartedly in support of the sentiments which have been expressed, but I respectfully suggest that in the Legislature which has jurisdiction over a province, this kind of thing is the greatest violation of such sentiments, and it is this kind of thing at which we must look and with which we must deal, rather than the enunciating expressions of so-called "high principles."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the application form of that Foundation was issued many years ago.

MR. MacDONALD: It is still in the application form.

HON. MR. FROST: That occurred years ago, in the days when in this province one of the battle cries was "no truck or trade with the Yankees." The hon. member should adjust himself to 1956.

MR. MacDONALD: So should they.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, these things have arisen by means of private arrangements, wills, private bequests, and trusts of years ago. Those things are there, but that is true of all countries and of all nations. If the hon. member goes back into the history of England and the United Kingdom, I suppose he will find all sorts of fantastic trusts which were made in the days when Napoleon was preparing to invade the United Kingdom.

I do not think that things of that sort—which arose in the past, and which are difficult or perhaps impossible to alter—in any way affect the sentiments of all people, the people of Ontario and the people of Canada, who are living and looking forward in this year 1956.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister is evading the point. This is a 1956 application form.

MR. ALLAN GROSSMAN (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members in the expression they have given to the spirit of brotherhood which is being taught by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews.

With other hon. members in this Legislature, I am aware of some of the things to which the hon. member for York South has drawn the attention of this House. I am very pleased to say that these things are in a very small minority, and that in this province of ours that sentiment is making absolutely no headway at all.

As I mentioned in my maiden speech the other day, I give a great deal of credit, not only to the government for its anti-discrimination legislation, but to the hon. Prime Minister for his attitude generally, in public affairs, which I be-

lieve has accomplished more than anything else in this respect.

We are not unaware of the matter which the hon. member for York South has brought to our attention. We are not unaware that there are vicious "crackpots" in our midst.

MR. MacDONALD: Why does the hon. Prime Minister defend them, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member should not take offence.

MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is entirely unfair for the hon. member to say that the hon. Prime Minister defended them.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister has just suggested I should not take offence.

MR. GROSSMAN: One would need a great stretch of imagination to put any such interpretation on the Prime Minister's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that on an occasion like this no one should try to make political capital out of the fine sentiments which have been expressed by hon. members of this House. Let us have a little more brotherhood in this Assembly. I hope the hon. members of this Legislature will, at any time they see things of this nature, bring them to the attention of the House.

However, I think that can be done without casting any bitter or acrimonious charges across the floor of the Legislature. I know every hon. member feels as the hon. Prime Minister does, that there is no room for that sort of thing in this country.

As I said the other day, I think we are making a great deal of progress. We will have to realize that man cannot live unto himself alone, but that we are all dependent on one another for existence. I think we see that spirit becoming increasingly apparent every day. Either we will do something about getting along with each other or the radioactive germs will "take over."



MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The fifth annual report of the Ontario Alcoholism Treatment and Research Foundation for the year ending December 31, 1955.

### THE LAKEHEAD COLLEGE OF ARTS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Hon. W. J. Dunlop moves second reading of Bill No. 56, "An Act to establish the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill—which goes to the Committee on Education tomorrow—has now special significance in view of the university situation as it exists in this province.

I suppose most of the hon. members in this House have read some parts of the report of the president of the University of Toronto, which appeared in the morning paper today. I should like to point out that this Bill provides a means for the establishment, the governing and operation of the Lakehead Institute of Arts, Science and Technology.

Possibly I might explain a little of the history of just what the development has been in this connection, and the significance of this particular new step, because it is one of the steps being taken to solve the university problem.

Thirty years ago, when I was on the staff of the University of Toronto, I was asked by the authorities of that day to go to the Lakehead and see whether a junior college could be established there. That was 30 years ago, Mr. Speaker. The idea was that a junior college might be established there in affiliation with the University of Toronto. I spent some time at the Lakehead, interviewed many members of councils, boards of trade, chambers of commerce and so on, and examined the situation from every angle. I soon found at that time—in 1926—there really was not sufficient population in that part of

the province to make a junior college feasible.

For example, one day a man came in to see me and said he did not want an arts college there, he wanted a medical school, because he had a son who wanted to study medicine. Two other men had sons wanting to study engineering, but there was not sufficient population to make a junior college possible at that time.

Having come originally from Grey County, and having some of the characteristics of the leaders of that county, I did not want to give up too easily, and I simply established a couple of evening classes and had to be satisfied with that.

Now, 30 years later, we are able to establish a college at the Lakehead, so presumably I was about 30 years ahead of my time then.

This new Lakehead college came about in this manner: in 1946—I do not know why these years come in 6's—I went up in 1926; the Lakehead Technical Institute was founded in 1946, and has been operating now for nearly 10 years.

This "Lakehead Technical Institute"—as we call it—has been entirely under The Department of Education. It has been poorly located for lack of a better site for it. It has been occupying a couple of army huts, and probably has not attracted as many students as it would have, had it been in more suitable quarters. However, it has attracted about 100; some years 70, some years 68, and then again nearly 100.

There are always young people in that part of the province, as in other parts, who like to come down to the southern area where the population is more dense and where the lights are probably brighter, and a great many have by-passed the Lakehead Technical Institute.

However, it has been offering first year university courses for 10 years, with good standards. Those who have completed first year at the Lakehead Technical Institute have been admitted to second year in the universities of

Ontario in arts, engineering—particularly mining engineering—commerce, forestry, and household economics or household science.

So the technical institute has served its purpose and served it well. We rather promised some time ago, perhaps informally, that if and when the situation was right for a junior college at the Lakehead, the government would provide 50 per cent. of the cost of a new building, and would also pay for the maintenance and operation of the building up to the same amount which is now being spent on the Lakehead Technical Institute.

However, this government always does better than it promises. Therefore, we are providing the full cost of the new building, and are also assisting with the maintenance and shall continue to do so.

The people up there have been optimistic indeed. It is a land of optimists. I have worked out a number of the details with my colleagues from that part of the province, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and the hon. member for Port Arthur, and others. The people there have raised a large sum, I understand \$175,000, and they are going to build an addition to the building which the government will erect, to utilize, in the best way possible, the money they have raised.

Then, the councils of Fort William and Port Arthur have each agreed to contribute \$1,000 a year for maintenance. So as soon as the snow is off the ground—and I believe there is a great deal of snow up there now—we will be ready to commence. The plans are ready and everything is ready to go.

Mr. Speaker, that is going to be a combination institute—and that is why I want the significance of it fully noted—it will be a junior college, and also an institute of technology. As an institute of technology it will be a replica of the Ryerson Institute of Technology, which has been such a great success. It will give two-year technical courses so that young people who wish to follow

up some particular line of activity, included in the technological make-up, may attend there for a couple of years taking any one or two of the courses, and if they wish to take an additional course, they could then attend the Ryerson Institute. So it will be an institute of technology, but it is also going to be a junior college of arts, where first and second year courses in arts will be given, as well as the first and second years in engineering, forestry, commerce and household science.

While we are establishing that institute and following out that procedure in that particular part of the province, we may not be able to follow the same procedure in other parts of the province. It may be that in some places we must have junior colleges alone; and in some places technical institutes alone. We are working on that at the present time.

A month ago today, I had a conference with the heads of all the universities in the Province of Ontario. We discussed the situation as it exists now. We knew perfectly well that the time for planning and surveying had passed, and now we must take action to solve the problem and that is what we decided to do.

Of course, I asked some questions as did the heads of the universities. I told them about this Lakehead college, and we discussed whether or not we should establish 6 or 7 or even a dozen junior colleges in the province, and if we did that we could maintain high standards and attach some of the present junior colleges to the universities.

As a result of that discussion, we found that, if we had junior colleges the universities would be able to administer them if they are within a reasonable distance, but they do not care to undertake the administration of junior colleges far removed from the university grounds.

So I think this one with which I am now dealing will be an independent college and technological institute, and indeed, this Bill which I am explaining provides for a board of governors and

general local management of the institution.

I think some of the other questions which were discussed may be of interest to the hon. members. One of the questions asked of them was: "How soon will it be before the universities of Ontario will co-operate 12 months of the year?"

I rather thought that might startle the heads of the universities, but it did not. They assured me that when the time comes, they will be willing to co-operate and to have the universities provide instruction 12 months a year.

Of course that does not mean professors will work 12 months a year, but the year will be divided into 4 quarters. Some students will take 3 of the quarters; some may take two; but it will all be worked out. There will have to be more staff, of course, but it will be arranged so that the present accommodations and the present facilities will be used to capacity.

Another question was: "Would it be possible now to make greater use of the present accommodations?" They were all quite willing to attempt that, because we know we are coming into the rush of new attendance now, and we will have to take some measures to meet the increased enrolment next year and the year after, and the much larger enrolment which will undoubtedly exist 10 years from now.

I asked, "For example, is there any objection to having lectures commence at 8 o'clock in the morning instead of 9, and carry on until 5 in the afternoon?" The answer was, "No, not at all. It will be possible to use lecture rooms and libraries all day and all year."

Hon. members can see, I received the greatest co-operation from the heads of the universities in Ontario. Already they are beginning to take action to meet the situation.

Another point, of course, is that the admission requirements may have to be raised somewhat. I understand one of the universities—not the one here because its standards are fairly high—is already planning to raise its admission

requirements for next September or October. No matter what buildings in the erection of which we may have to assist, there must always be insistence on the maintenance of the very highest of standards in every university in this province.

There will have to be increased and enhanced admission requirements in all of the universities. There is no use allowing people to enroll in the universities if they do not wish to work, and if they are only attending—as they formerly did—for the social events of the first year, and then leaving. We do not want that sort of student at all, and we must set high standards and rigorously maintain them.

However, there is something we must not have, Mr. Speaker, and something which I know we are not going to have at this Lakehead college. We just must not have restriction of admission to those who have met the admission requirements.

You can understand, Mr. Speaker—as can all hon. members—the necessity for restricting admissions to the faculty of medicine, for example, where there may not always be sufficient clinical material, or enough ill people upon whom they can practice.

We can understand, for the same reason, restricting admissions to the faculty of dentistry; but there cannot be—and there must never be in this province—any restriction of admission to arts, engineering or to other similar courses.

For example, when a man sends his son to the university and all the requirements for admission to that university in arts have been completed, and the university says—if it ever does say—"We cannot take you because we are overcrowded," the parent becomes infuriated, and the public is infuriated if young people who meet the standards are not admitted. We want high standards, but we want no restrictions.

As we proceed with this Lakehead college, there are some suggestions one might make to the people in that part of the province, some suggestions which



might have a tendency to make that college an attractive place. In the first place, regarding the building itself, the physical accommodation will be not only of a utilitarian type, but it will be beautiful as well. We want to make it an attractive place for young people to go, if they wish to enter the institute for two years, and then come down to the university here for one or two years, as the case may be.

Some day, of course, it will be a university in its own right. It is commencing as Carleton College and Assumption College commenced. They both now have degree-granting powers, and this new college will grow too.

However, we are not granting these powers at the present time. We are commencing moderately, but when the time comes, full powers will be granted. But if the industrial firms up there, and individuals as well, should find it in their hearts to provide scholarships for students entering the junior college, or to provide bursaries for those who might need them in that college, I can suggest first of all that one way to make it an attractive place will be to provide such scholarships and bursaries locally, and I am sure that will be done.

I am looking forward with the greatest pleasurable anticipation to seeing a really strong educational institute serving that great part of the province. Of course, this new college is not a sublimated high school, by any means. We are not going to count the number of classrooms, and so forth. We are establishing something which will be a centre of learning just as a university is, and a place to which young people can come and attend lectures, have discussions with their professors, have seminars, and do their own work, not waiting to be taught in class, but dependent upon themselves to get the very best out of the opportunities they have.

This new college will begin, at the outset, to carry out those functions which make a university. As I have said, a university is not a sublimated high school. It has the teaching functions, and the public puts that first—and probably it should be. Some people

think that teaching is the primary function of a successful university. But it also has the function of research. These professors are handing out knowledge, but they must also have time to produce more knowledge, and that is what research is, the production of more knowledge.

Then there is the third function, the publication of the new knowledge which has been discovered. So there is, in general, that for which I am hoping regarding this new Lakehead college, that it is going to become the university for the northwestern part of the province, where there will be good teaching, plenty of research, and the publication of the new knowledge which is discovered.

In this Bill, Mr. Speaker, provision is made for a Board of Governors of not more than 24 members. The councils of each of the two cities will appoint a member; the Minister of Education will appoint 3 members and, generally, the various provisions of this Bill provide for carrying on and maintaining a university, very much the same pattern as those now in existence in southern Ontario.

I think we can all realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are commencing something today which is the beginning of a new era in higher education in this province, a new era when we will have more and more young people developed to take on their work a little later, and if we are able to carry on and provide some of these junior colleges and technical institutes, we will have the greatest educational province—in fact, the greatest educational country—in North America.

With these words, Mr. Speaker, I again move second reading of Bill No. 56.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to say that my heart—together with the hearts of all the people of northwestern Ontario—is filled with gratitude and thanks to the hon. Minister of Education and this government, for the wonderful thing they are doing for northwestern Ontario in making

possible a 30-year-old dream of a Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology.

I think it is very fitting that the present hon. Minister of Education should have been the one who came up to our part of the country 30 years ago and said there should be a university in that part of Ontario, and he is now the one who is the head of the department of government which is making it possible. I wish to thank him very much indeed and all those who have assisted him in making it possible.

I also wish to thank the good people in the northwestern part of Ontario for their substantial contributions to the making of this dream a reality at last.

There is one thing to which I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, and that is the beautiful site upon which this university will stand. It is the only time in my knowledge that all of northwestern Ontario, including the two cities of Port Arthur and Fort William, were in full accord. The site was chosen by a joint body representing the two cities in that part of Ontario, and there was no rift in the unanimity of opinion as to where the site should be.

Mr. Speaker, in effect today we are using a two-foot yardstick; in other words, we are speeding things up, and are getting closer together, and, therefore, in the world of specialization in which we are living today, we are serving a large area remote from the other parts of Canada.

There is no single part of Canada which has a premium on brain power. The whole of northern Ontario is represented by forestry and mining operations, and if we are going to exist, we will have to develop the finest skills and the finest trained minds possible, in order to serve our people in these great operations which we are fortunate enough to have in our district.

Human nature has not changed, as we all know, but technological skills have changed, and on that score, if we go back to the days of Greece and Rome, we must realize and acknowledge that the philosophies which applied then have

not changed. We are still making the same mistakes, we all agree.

Toronto University—this wonderful university—perhaps is getting too big, and there is a great need for other areas to be served by universities, rather than that they be centralized in such places as Toronto, Kingston, London, and other points in the east. I think it was Disraeli who said, "Change is inevitable." In a progressive country, we know that change is constant.

Mr. Speaker, our boys and girls for years have not had an opportunity of going to the universities nearer their homes. They have had to attend these universities at different points in the east. Imagine what this university will do for the entire teaching profession, as well as the country of northwestern Ontario. It will give our people a new cultural outlook, and make possible for them some of the finer things in life. They will have a centre which will serve both east and west for a distance of 500 miles, and if Ontario is to progress, we must expand, both economically and otherwise, and increase the educational facilities at the Lakehead.

We cannot stand still. We have reached the point where if we endeavour to stand still, we will go backward. A vow we made many years ago is one that must not be broken, and that is, we must give our boys and girls in northwestern Ontario an equal opportunity with the rest of the province to receive the best in educational facilities.

In the past years, our boys and girls have had to come to Toronto, London, Kingston, westerly to Manitoba and other points, and it has cost the parents in our district at least \$2,000 a year to send a child to university. It can well be imagined that a parent might be able to afford to send one, or perhaps two of his children, but when it reaches a greater number, they just cannot afford to send their children to secure a university education such as they would like to do.

This will open up a brand new vista, and will mean our boys and girls will have the opportunity of securing a university degree.

One thing we have found is that when our boys and girls come to the great seats of learning in the east or west, they form associations during their scholastic years which tend to keep them in the locality in which the university is located, and in that way we are losing a great deal of trained brain power, which does not come back to our section of the province. That is one thing which a university at the Lakehead will prevent in the future.

To show you how industry is becoming interested in this university, I would like to read the remarks of Mr. D. W. Ambridge, the president of the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, when speaking to the chamber of commerce at the Lakehead on February 15. He said:

Regarding the training of skilled men, Ambridge said Abitibi was a "recent convert to the idea that industry must get into the educational picture in a big way."

Commenting on the Lakehead college of arts and sciences, which is to be established in Port Arthur, he said: "We stand ready to help with this project in any way we can. Our facilities in skilled men and laboratories and shops are at your disposal. Our management is ready to help in any way that promises to provide . . . a larger crop of competent citizens at the Lakehead."

Ambridge suggested the formation of an industrial council to be of assistance to the college authorities in arranging holiday work in the mills, and lectures by the leading engineers and chemists. He said Abitibi is willing to help in every way possible including apprenticeships, scholarships and attracting the best teachers. His speech was interrupted at this point by sustained cheers and applause.

The president pointed out with pride to the technological advances in the industry that will enable greater use of existing forests. He also described the reforestation programme carried on by the paper mills, which will assure the future supply of pulp.

There is a man who is at the head of a great industry who sees the need for this great seat of learning in north-western Ontario, and recognizes what it will do to develop the natural resources in that great part of the province.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot understand why our Federal Government is not assisting in a university of this kind in a greater measure. If you consider the Federal Government's programme in the United States, you will notice the millions and millions of dollars being poured into the universities to educate the boys and girls of the United States of America, and I think our Federal Government should be doing a great deal more to assist projects of that kind which mean so much to the nation.

I would like to suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition—who is always persuasive in his arguments and has a marvellous way in his stentorian tones of securing what he starts out to get, in the most pleasant way—that he use his best efforts with the authorities at Ottawa to endeavour to see that a substantial amount is made available for this project at the Lakehead.

I leave that thought with him, and I am sure the people in our district will be very happy to get some idea as to what he thinks the Federal Government should do in this connection.

May I again, Mr. Speaker, express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the hon. Minister of Education and the government, and to say that this is another example of the way our hon. Prime Minister's "Old Man Ontario" has come to the fore once again, and has translated the needs of this province into action.

MR. OLIVER: Once in a while.

MR. MacDONALD: Every now and then.

MR. WARDROPE: That is why, Mr. Speaker, I say, even in the face of what the Opposition may say, the hon. Prime Minister will head the government of this province for many years to come.



MR. W. G. NODEN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of making a few observations in connection with Bill 56, moved for second reading today by the hon. Minister of Education, for the establishment of a Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology.

May I be permitted to express some of the impressions of the people in the northwestern part of Ontario, and especially of those in the Rainy River district. It was my pleasure to accompany the hon. Minister of Education through my riding 2 or 3 years ago, providing him with an opportunity to observe the needs of that district by visiting some 42 classrooms, and he became very sympathetic to the requirements of our youth and the future education of our growing citizens.

Today, when I heard the hon. Minister mention some incidents of 30 years ago, I look back to the days when the Lakehead Technical Institute was established, and I know some of the youths who have taken advantage of that opportunity for higher training to specialize in their studies, and have become connected with the technical branches in industry today, and are showing the results of the higher education they received from the technical institute.

Then I am reminded of an occurrence of a couple of years ago when the present hon. Minister of Education established the summer school for elementary school teachers, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, that has been of wonderful advantage in our educational programme in northwestern Ontario.

Up until that time, we had to depend in our area upon school teachers from old Ontario to take care of our needs. Since this summer school was brought into being, and during the first year of its operation, a great percentage of students came from our area, and today they are taking care of a great part of the needs in our section, as far as schools are concerned, particularly in the rural areas.

When it was announced today that we are going to have a Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, I sincerely believe that is another forward step. The hon. Prime Minister of this province has visited the northwestern part of Ontario on different occasions, and has become very sympathetic to the needs of that section of the province. He knows them, and I am sure when he used the expression, "It is a good, sound investment", it could be well applied in connection with our future educational needs.

I want to commend this government, under the leadership of our hon. Prime Minister, for taking this step in providing the means of education for the youth in our area and the opportunity to acquire higher education in our locality, because in many instances in the past it has not been convenient for parents to send their children some 1,200 miles to Toronto, and it has on many occasions proven too great a hardship, although, in fact, a great many have actually come down here.

Furthermore, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we in our district have one gentleman, Mr. Mathieu, who has set up an educational fund whereby students may borrow money to put themselves through universities, at a very low interest rate of one per cent. per annum. In the last year, the same gentleman has set up 3 scholarships, providing sufficient money to provide students a university course, without the money having to be repaid.

Education is coming to the fore in northwestern Ontario, and this government is to be commended very highly for that.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, the second reading of this Bill provides an opportunity to look at what I believe is one of the major problems facing Ontario and, as a matter of fact, all parts of this Dominion. The problem has not yet developed in its full proportion but as the hon. Minister has indicated and

as the president of the University of Toronto in his annual report has emphasized, we must take cognizance of the matter now, because if we do not do so, in 10 years' time we will be swamped.

I wonder if hon. members of this Legislature are aware of the fact that in 1954, for the first time in history, there were more babies born in the Province of Ontario than in the Province of Quebec. I do not know whether that is another of the great achievements of this province for which the hon. Prime Minister will take credit, as one of the achievements of the Progressive Conservative Party. Undoubtedly, he will.

HON. MR. FROST: There are points in its favour, alright.

MR. MacDONALD: That record for 1954 helps to emphasize the phenomenal increase in the birth rate during the war years and post-war years, which has created a wave of students signing up through our educational system. It will result in the doubling of the number of young people who will be attending our universities in 1965. If we are to be able to cope with this developing situation, we must face the problem now.

Even with the financial barriers that block so many seeking a higher education we cannot hope to cope with the percentage of the population which will wish to get into the universities, if we do not expand facilities for them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the hon. Minister, at one point, when he expressed opposition to any attempt to use higher standards as a means of restricting enrolment in general university courses.

While there may be some value in raising standards for people seeking to enter the universities, clearly the reason why the standards are being raised now, is not because of the fact that we feel there is an impelling need to do so, but rather that we have not the facilities to accommodate them, and therefore

we are making it even more restrictive for an adequate proportion of our younger generation to get a higher education.

We must take a good hard look at the fact that today the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario have one of the smallest proportions of population, say, between the ages of 15 and 24, having the opportunities of higher education, smaller than almost any of the countries of the western world.

For example, today about 10 per cent. of the young people between the ages of 15 and 24 are enjoying the opportunities of higher education in the Province of Ontario. In the United States generally, about 30 per cent. are enjoying the opportunities of one kind or another for a form of higher education.

Part of the problem arises because of the limited opportunities, and of the lack of financial assistance to our younger people to enrol into these universities. I do not wish to dwell unduly upon that point today, but I want to emphasize and associate myself with the remarks of the hon. Minister when he states that he hopes the day will never come when we will prevent our young people from getting into universities because the standards have been raised so high that we reduce the proportion, once again, of those who have the opportunities for a higher education.

I do not think it is at all surprising, as we face the problem of expanded university facilities, that the cry should have arisen for new facilities for northern Ontario. Most of our institutions of higher learning in the Province of Ontario are concentrated in the southern part of the province. I wish to tell the hon. member for Port Arthur and other hon. members from the north that I do not concede them one iota in enthusiasm for the possibilities of life in northern Ontario. I know no part of the country where the spirit of the frontier, and excitement and general optimism are more a part of life than they are there; and where, going from the more stolid portion of the south to visit the north is like taking a refresher course.

Therefore, in developing our university facilities, it is well that we should have started with the building of a junior college, but let us not underestimate the difficulties involved in northern Ontario. We must take a hard look at the basic requirements for building a junior college which may some day grow into a genuine university.

Hon. members of this House are aware of the fact that there have been demands from many other areas of northern Ontario for a junior college which would eventually emerge as a university. These demands have come from the area of Sault Ste. Marie, from the area of Sudbury, and from the area of North Bay. In the local newspapers recently I discovered there was some discussion in the council of the City of Timmins, as to the possibility of having a university in that area. In other words, this is a demand which will emerge from many parts of the province.

So it becomes necessary for us to look at the basic requirements, the necessary ingredients, for the successful launching and establishing of a new institution of higher learning. Clearly, the first ingredient is that you should have a large enough population base. In the case of northwestern Ontario, I think this area of the province now qualifies.

If we turn our eyes eastwards, we discover that in the Maritime Provinces we have several small universities: Dalhousie University, St. Francis Xavier University, Acadia University, Mount Allison and the University of New Brunswick. Each one of those universities has not the population base you have today in northwestern Ontario. Therefore, there is justification today for a new university in the northwest.

In the case of Atikokan, in the riding of Rainy River, I understand the planning board has developed a plan for a city of 25,000 people, and in the near future it is expected it is going to be a city of 10,000 people.

When you take into consideration the development which has taken place in Manitouwadge, in the Red Lake area,

and in the intervening areas between those places and the head of the lakes, if we are to attract the students to an Ontario university, rather than let them seek education in Winnipeg—as many of them have done—we must think on the basis of a new college which can grow some day into a university.

Mr. Speaker, I think that two other ingredients are necessary in the building of a university. I would like to refer to what they are, and how they exist, by referring to what was done in the way of the building of a university, by citing the instance of Carleton College.

I lived in the City of Ottawa in the days when Carleton College was coming into being. If we look at Carleton College today and see the really phenomenal growth it has attained in the brief period of years it has been in existence, we will see that there are two reasons why its development reached the point it has.

One of those reasons is that, from the outset, it had one of those men who has a touch of genius about him, a man who was not only a person of great stature in the educational world—I am referring to the late Dr. Tory—but a man who had great administrative ability. This combination of stature in the educational world and administrative ability provided that quality which attracted people to the building of the university. I want to suggest that this is going to be one of our problems in northwestern Ontario.

There was another ingredient in the picture in Ottawa, which made it possible for a new university college to emerge, and that is, in the immediate area of Ottawa you had a great range of personnel resources, people who could be brought in on a part-time basis to assist in building that university.

It would seem to me, as an onlooker, that Carleton College may have one of the brightest of futures, in terms of creating post-graduate courses in government administration, because of the fact that they have some of the top-flight civil servants of the world. That has been acknowledged in international circles, and in the government. They



are subject to being called up, and are called upon, and day in and day out take part by giving lectures in Carleton College. They have this resource in personnel, because of the fact that the Federal Government and the administration are there. That is helping in providing a very advanced training by the people of experience who can be drawn upon for that purpose.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is like hon. Mr. Pickersgill.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps the hon. Provincial Secretary would agree with me if we started talking about hon. Mr. Pickersgill.

The question I want to raise is that I am not certain that in the last two instances, namely, the kind of leadership required and the resources in terms of personnel, we can wink at the fact that you may have a real difficulty in establishing a university in northwestern Ontario, granted you have the population base.

I ask the question—and ask it as a question and not as a dogmatic assertion—as something at which we should take a good solid look. For example, my information, from people at the Lakehead—people who are very interested in the development of this university—is that the staff today is actually one full-time member less than it was 3 years ago, that the size of the student body has not grown from year to year, but that it, in terms of full-time students today, is about at the figure at which it began in 1948, namely, 55 to 60 full-time students. I know that the hon. Minister used the figures “80 to 100.” I would explain the discrepancy there as being due to part-time students.

With the exception of first year of two-year courses for laboratory technicians, there has been no extension of courses other than night courses in prospecting and accounting. The new school now offers the first year of a university course in arts and applied sciences, and courses in mining and forestry.

My information—and I am certain it is reliable—is that technical courses in

the years that the Technical Institute has been in existence have not been blooming, that even the principal had to get on the telephone at the last minute to secure enough students to make up a sizable class for some of the mining courses; and that the handful of students who completed the forestry course could not find suitable positions and were forced to go on degree-granting courses at the University of New Brunswick.

There is another point. Because of the limited opportunity in the immediate area to draw upon qualified personnel for teaching on a part-time basis, the full-time staff has been carrying an inordinate load. At the present time, the full-time staff consists of 7 people; 3 of them have to engage in other money-making activities in order to survive. The single full-time lecturer in the arts course—and let us stop for a moment to consider this one full-time lecturer in the whole of the arts course—has a lecturing load of 16 hours a week.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I do not raise these questions in any sense of criticism. I am as whole-heartedly and as emphatically in favour of this project as anybody from the north. I suggest, however, that you have a situation, because of the particular problem of an area that is so far away, and that has not had—except perhaps in forestry and mining—the resources of personnel, wherein you have some real problems to solve.

In presenting this to the House in the first instance, the hon. Minister spoke in terms of this institution growing into a degree-granting university. He spoke in most optimistic tones. I do not blame him for the optimistic tone; I am an incorrigible optimist myself. I was interested to note in a local newspaper in Port Arthur, a report of this Bill coming down in the House was published, but from local people who are engaged in the conduct of this institution at the present time, and from whom undoubtedly a great deal of this information came, there was a much more cautious note.

That is indicated, for example, in this one or two sentences in the news story in the Port Arthur *News Chronicle* for February 11. Here are the sentences:

The new board of governors will have the authority to change and enlarge on the courses to be provided in the new college, and it is hoped that with increased enrolment, courses at the second year university level can be initiated.

I just draw your attention to the fact that in 6 or 8 years there has not been an increase in enrolment; so, on the basis of their own premise, there is not in the immediate future the possibility of filling even the second year courses.

It may be, as the hon. Minister said, that is because of the inadequate accommodations in which they have had to operate up to the present. However, I draw your attention to the fact that, in reference to every new university which has come into existence—Carleton College being one—the inadequacy of the accommodations has been no deterrent. These buildings have become jammed with hundreds of students until they were bursting at the seams. It was that kind of pressure which resulted in expansion and in the building of a university—because they had the necessary entrants, which may be lacking up there. I do not say definitely that they are lacking.

Therefore, it seems to me it will be extremely necessary to have a full degree of co-operation, not only from The Department of Education—which I am confident will be given—but a degree of co-operation with existing universities, in order that it may be able to make of itself a successful venture.

I am rather taken aback a bit, quite frankly, by the statement of the hon. Minister to the effect that this junior college is so far away that it will have to be established on an independent basis without affiliation. I am aware of the fact that President Sidney Smith, of the University of Toronto, and President Hall, of Western University, have in recent months and years expressed

the belief that, as we build junior colleges, they should be affiliated with one of the existing universities, for the obvious benefits which would flow from that affiliation.

Now, because of the distance of this new college at the head of the lakes from existing universities, apparently there has been a belief that there would be affiliation. If that is not the case, I respectfully suggest that this is going to eliminate one of the main ways in which you can cope with one of the lacking ingredients in that city, for making a university or making it grow as quickly as we would wish to see it grow.

I would like to explore further whether it is not possible, even on a less ambitious basis, to affiliate the college at the Lakehead with some existing university, if we cannot provide for it some of the greater measure of experience and broader personnel to assure the kind of success we want in this new development, about which the hon. member for Port Arthur has spoken so enthusiastically.

I do not wish to go further, because if I do I would get into details which should more properly be dealt with in committee or perhaps when the Bill comes back into the House again.

I suggest that we cannot wink at the problems which are already in front of us in the establishing of these new institutions, because, if we do wink at them, we may do so at the risk of hurting the future of an institution we would like to see grow and thrive.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, our great north country did not build itself on the type of optimism that the hon. member for York South has just expounded, the part-time teachers he speaks of, Bartley and Greer, and those in other positions at the Lakehead, who had the idea of giving him the information he has given this afternoon. Jack Miner once said: "If it were not for the builders of Canada, the 'pull-downs' would soon be out of employment."

I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the kind of optimism we want in the North.

MR. MacDONALD: I have not pulled down anything. I have emphasized that my enthusiasm for this project is as great as that of anyone else. The arts course is the heart and soul of the institution, apart from the technological end. The name is "arts, science and technology", but the arts course which the hon. Minister has indicated is the kind of thing which should be available to everyone with as limited restrictions as possible. For that course you have one full-time teacher who is inordinately overburdened.

Maybe the \$175,000 which was raised in the area, and which is now going to be saved because the Government of Ontario is going to pay the whole cost, instead of half, will provide an opportunity for securing extra staff; but if we do not meet these problems we are creating a hard future for an institution you want to help. Do not accuse me of false optimism. That has no place in the picture.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to what the hon. member for York South has said about the requirements of personnel, and to a large extent I agree with him. That, of course, is one of the great difficulties in extending university work. As a matter of fact, we have suggestions from various areas that a university should be started. Oft-times, the difficulties of doing that are completely underestimated by the good people who want the project to proceed.

It is very difficult to obtain staff covering all the various phases of university requirements. That is one of the difficulties we face in Canada and in Ontario today. As the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) will tell you, it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure those who can teach in the sciences and in mathematics.

The hon. member has said that the difficulty apparently extends into some of the general arts subjects. We recog-

nize the difficulty there. They are very real difficulties, which Canada has to face, and when I refer to "Canada", I put it on the broad basis of our country.

In the world in which we are living we will require the skills which come from university and technical training. That is particularly true, as I have said, in mathematics and sciences. If we are not abreast of the times, then Canada will fail because of a lack of technical skills. I think that is one of the very important things to which this country must address itself, the matter of getting the people who have the ability, the education, and the technical skills to cope with this complicated world in which we live today.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, again, that the problem there is of manpower, of getting the people who are skilled, and have the training and ability to meet the great challenges of our province and of our country. That problem is one to which all Canadians should address themselves, and upon that depends to a very large extent the gross national production of this country.

We talk about "gross national production": The gross national production in our country cannot come about unless we have men and women who are capable and trained to do the job. That is the great challenge with which our country and perhaps the western world will be faced in the next 25 years or more.

I would say it is a problem for the two governments. As a matter of fact, if you put it on a very materialistic basis, the revenues of the Federal Government will depend to a very great extent upon the productivity of our manpower which is sufficiently trained to bring to accomplishment the many tasks we have here in Canada.

The problem, of course, is complicated from a national standpoint by the obvious provisions of the British North America Act which makes education a matter for the provinces. I think we should be practical enough to recognize the fact that education is going to be a



problem for the provinces. That must necessarily be so, because of the constitution of our country, and the underlying reason that led to the passing and enacting of certain provisions in the constitution of our country.

On the other hand, taking the broad national view, in university training there is a place—and I think a place there can be worked out by agreement—for both federal and provincial participation. This problem is a very enormous one indeed.

One of the great challenging problems of our country is the matter of university education to develop the skills, training and cultures of people who have had the advantage of that type of training. Nevertheless, in the last dozen years, we have, I think, a good many reasons for thinking we have made progress in that connection.

I very well remember, back in 1943, we then had 3 universities in Ontario receiving grants: the University of Toronto, which is the largest university, Queen's, and the University of Western Ontario. I very well remember that one of the first problems with which I was confronted at that time was the fact that these 3 universities were all in varying degrees of insolvency due to the fact that when the hon. members opposite were in power with their very forward-looking (?) ideas, they had cut the university grants to the bone, with the result they were all in debt. All 3 universities were overpowered with many hundreds of thousands of dollars of debt, and their position was indeed very difficult and very desperate.

I remember very well meeting with the various university boards at that time, and the representations which were made to me by the late Dr. Cody and by Dr. Bruce McDonald, who were then faced with this problem. I think Dr. Cody at that time was president of the University of Toronto.

In the face of all this, we have—12 years later—a very different picture. That it is as we would want it. That it will meet the requirements of the future,

I would not say, Mr. Speaker, but I do point out that those 3 universities have been “bailed out” of the financial mire in which they were after 9 years of administration by the hon. members opposite.

MR. NIXON: They were in a worse mire before.

MR. OLIVER: Remember the days of Henry.

HON. MR. FROST: During the days of the hon. members opposite, the situation was black indeed.

MR. OLIVER: Not as black as it was before.

HON. MR. FROST: After the present government came into power, things began to change for the better, and the universities have been placed in a position where if it were not for the great problems which obviously must be faced in the future, their financial position, as well as their position in other respects, would be quite good. But we have gone beyond that.

In the first 120 years of the history of Ontario, we had 3 universities which were engaged in university work, and which were receiving grants as such from the people of Ontario. Today, we have no less than 7 universities, and, with the assistance being given to what we hope will be a budding university, we will have 8.

I will not give the order in which these things came about. Perhaps it was Ottawa University which was the first taken into the grant system, because of the magnificent work they were then doing, and are now doing, in connection with medical science. This university, which of course is a sectarian university, but which has been doing non-sectarian work, in that regard, has really a very magnificent record, and presented a great story of achievement in the past 12 years.

In Ottawa is also located the university which the hon. member mentioned, Carleton College, which had its beginning as he says, during the great work

and influence of Dr. Tory, and afterwards, Dr. MacOdrum, who was doing magnificent work until his untimely passing a few months ago.

It is only a few days ago the Treasury Board had the opportunity of hearing presented a programme of that new university, under the direction of the chairman of its board, Mr. Coyne, also governor of the Bank of Canada.

In the meantime we have, in the great City of Hamilton, McMaster University, which was a sectarian university forming Hamilton College, an institution which is majoring in many things, particularly in the nuclear sciences. In the period of a comparatively short time, there have been very great advances in the scientific university work in that college. More recently, within the last year, we have had Assumption College, which previously had been affiliated with the University of Western Ontario, although removed by some 130 or 140 miles from the University of Western Ontario at London, assuming a university status of its own.

Now, through the enterprise of the good people of Windsor, we have established Essex College, which will be a non-sectarian college connected with the university, which will bring into being this year, by capital and maintenance grants, the seventh university in Ontario.

The future predictions give us considerable concern because, as the figures given at the Royal Commission hearings held in this chamber some 3 or 4 weeks ago show, it is quite possible our university population will grow in number from 20-odd thousand at the present time to possibly 80,000 within the next 20 or 25 years. That will create an enormous problem in itself.

The hon. Minister of Education speaks of using our buildings and equipment all the day around. That is an absolute necessity. We will probably do much better by spending our money on extension of staff, and using the physical assets we have in universities in the form of apparatus and buildings, to a very much greater degree all year around, perhaps by dividing the year into a quarterly system.

In doing so, I by no means infer—and I know the hon. Minister of Education did not infer—that it would be possible to work the university staff 365 days of the year. Such a thing is completely impossible. It would be very much wiser to work our buildings and equipment on a 365-day basis.

However, I think we can feel that in the growth of our universities from 3 to 7, and now perhaps an incipient 8th, that in the last dozen years we have made great progress, and with that has come about an increased university population. That the university population will be in keeping with these figures, I cannot now say, for the reason that following the war we had a very heavy population, for instance, at the University of Toronto, necessitating temporary quarters at Ajax and other places being made available.

We had the after-war flood of students coming into these universities, but, nevertheless, considering the overall levelling off period, the growth of university attendance, and the number of universities and the increases in staff, we have made very remarkable progress indeed. However, by no means do I say that to create an atmosphere of complacency, because it is not a situation in which we should be complacent.

Our people must be appraised of, and understand, the fact that in the field of education we are faced with an enormous problem in Canada today—for this is true not only in Ontario but in Canada as a whole. I could tell the hon. members of the House of the problems in connection with the medical profession, the dental profession, engineering, sciences and so on. These are matters which the people of Canada and of the province must place high on the priority list of things which we must do in the coming days.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Inasmuch as I am in agreement with the principle embodied in this Bill, it had not been my intention to make any remarks on it at this time; however, the discussion

which has taken place prompts me to say a word or two.

I would say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that I share the optimism of northwestern Ontario that they can get the necessary enrolment which will make this school a success. I cannot conceive of the people of northwestern Ontario going into their pockets and contributing \$175,000, nor I cannot further conceive of this government spending, or being willing to spend, hundreds of thousands of dollars which they are prepared to put into this building in Port Arthur, without first having canvassed and explored the potential which exists in that part of the country.

I am quite convinced of this, Mr. Speaker, that as the potential for learning is advanced at the Lakehead "college" or "university"—or whatever you want to call it—you must have every reason to expect that the enrolment will also increase, because of the added advantages which are offered. I would be very much surprised if the enrolment does not reach the expectations of the people of northwestern Ontario, and I do not share the doubts expressed by the hon. member for York South in that respect.

The only point I want to raise is this—and with this I agree with the hon. member for York South; and when I have a 50-50 batting average with him, I think it is all right—in connection with the question of affiliation. The hon. Prime Minister did not mention that matter when he spoke. I consider, if we could have an affiliation between this college and the University of Toronto, it would be all to the good. I can see difficulties arising because of the lack of that affiliation, and I can see the great good which would flow from having that sort of affiliation.

What I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Education, and what I think the hon. members of the House should know, is regarding this lack of affiliation. Does it grow from an impossible situation? Is it impossible to have affiliation between this new college and the university? Is it impractical, or

not government policy? Do they feel it would not be the right thing? I think the hon. Minister should tell the hon. members of the House what the position of the government is in relation to this. It would be very helpful.

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): As the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the situation was very carefully surveyed in order to make sure that the prospects were all that we hope they will be. I did take up with two presidents of universities the problem of affiliation.

I would not say they would refuse affiliation if it were very definitely asked for, but they both expressed a good deal of reluctance. They wondered how they would administer a college at that great distance.

I do not think that is a final answer. We might find it would be a good idea to have affiliation a little later on, but in the meantime, they would rather not. Indeed they are so anxious about the situation in each of their own institutions, that they are not willing to take on anything outside, as I understand it. I have discussed it with both of them.

I am sure, as time goes on, I can make arrangements for visiting professors. I did that when I had classes at the Lakehead. I would secure a professor of geology, who would go up there for perhaps 6 weeks; then another time, have a professor of mineralogy, and then a professor of English.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, the hon. members of this House, that amongst the heads and staff of the university and The Department of Education the closest co-operation exists; there is the best of feeling, and if we want any assistance, I feel that we certainly will be able to get it, and we will do so.

The enrolment at the present time in the Lakehead Technical Institute is not large. There are 29 students taking the technical courses, and in the arts courses, there are 45 students, according to the latest information furnished to me. There are 25 part-time students,



and a staff of 7 with several part-time instructors in addition.

Then there is the matter of teachers for that part of the province, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Rainy River. I was up there 3 or 4 years ago, and at that time I was arranging a summer course in order to solve the shortage of teachers in the elementary field, and certain members of the chamber of commerce in one of those communities said—this has also been referred to by the hon. member for Rainy River—"We are depending on southern Ontario for our teachers, who come up and stay a couple of years, and then leave; could we not have some trained up here?" I said: "I do not know whether you can or not, but if you undertake to have 25 students ready in that building of ours to take this emergency pre-teachers' college course on July 1, I will undertake to give the course here."

The people in that part of the province are optimists, as we have been told several times today, and they did undertake to provide prospective teachers, and they provided 54.

That is the sort of thing I am expecting will happen in connection with this Lakehead college. I have seen many educational ventures begin in a small way, and grow steadily and substantially into something absolutely worthwhile, and I have no fears whatever about the future of the Lakehead college.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE MINING ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves second reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I gave an explanation of this Bill on first reading, and told the House it would be referred to the Standing Committee on Mining.

The purpose of this Bill is to abolish the Mining Court of Ontario.

Such jurisdiction as is now vested in the mining court can be exercised by a new officer, to be called the "mining

commissioner," and appointed by the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council, to whom the jurisdiction is transferred.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, when this Bill was first introduced, I referred to the fact that it seemed to me there might be some constitutional issue involved in this particular Bill.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I am not concerned at this time with the substance of the Bill; I am not suggesting whether it is a desirable or an undesirable thing to do, that is, what the government purports to do. But I am concerned with the real doubt I have in my mind as to whether the government is in a position, legally speaking, to do what it purports to do, particularly in part VII, and more specifically, subsection 115 of that part.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour this point unnecessarily, and so that I may be more specific in my objection, I would like to point out that it is elementary constitutional law that the Dominion Government has exclusive jurisdiction in regard to the appointment of judges exercising judicial powers.

In making that broad statement, I recognize it is subject to this observation, that in respect to inferior judges, the province has the power to appoint such members of the judiciary, for example, as family court judges or something of that sort.

However, by and large, I think it can be said that it is the exclusive power of the Federal Government by virtue of sections 92 and 96 of The British North America Act, to vest that power in the Federal Government. I acknowledge, of course, the right of the province to form courts and administer them, but the power to make the appointment of judges is exclusively in the Federal Government.

When the hon. members examine this particular Bill, they will note that whereas a judge, whom I understand had heretofore been appointed by the Federal Government in conformity with the normal constitutional procedure,

hereafter will be represented in the province by a commissioner, who will be appointed by the province, and my suggestion is that the appointment may well be unconstitutional.

I am not suggesting absolutely that it is; I am quite prepared to acknowledge that when you examine the authorities on the subject, you will find several instances of decided cases which suggest that it may lie within the power of the province to do what the government purports to do here. But there are certain judges who, upon examining the same facts, will suggest that it is not.

Two specific cases, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, have been discussed and decided by the courts relative to the appointment of a mining commissioner, or, at least, having to do with the authority exercised by a mining judge of this province. I will acknowledge that in either of these cases—the so-called McLean case, and another earlier case—this problem was dealt with, but I do not think we can look to those cases for authority that it was or was not constitutional.

But I would suggest that an examination of these cases does demonstrate that there is grave doubt as to the constitutional right of the province to do an act such as is purported to be done under the sections to which I have referred.

What I am basically concerned about is this: if there be doubt in my mind, I am inclined to think there will be doubt in the minds of others in the legal profession, and the probable procedure may be, if we enact this legislation, that a case will come before the commissioner, who will decide on the facts, and someone will be dissatisfied with the decision, and at the time will argue before some competent court that this particular Statute is unconstitutional.

If that happens, after this House is prorogued, we will have no opportunity of amending the Act in any manner which might be required to make it legal.

I understand, at the present time, the judge has a great backlog of cases, and

I would not want to add more confusion to the practical administration of this court than there is at the present time.

For these reasons, I suggest we have a very simple and ready amendment, that under The Judicature Act we are entitled to refer this matter to the Court of Appeals for a decision. That reference will give us, in unmistakable terms, in a quick and speedy decision in the situation as it exists, and I am sure the hon. Attorney-General could use his good offices in securing a quick decision on this particular point. I would hope we would have such a decision before this House prorogues, and we will then be in a position to be assured that the legislation, which may be the most desirable in the world, is definitely constitutional.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize I am not taking the position that I am a constitutional authority at all, but my examination of the cases to which I referred—and others—has created a doubt in my mind on the question of the constitutionality of this particular Act, and I think in view of that great doubt, this Act should not be enacted in its present form, until such time as the problem is resolved.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I can explain the background of the situation referred to by the hon. member for Waterloo North. I have been familiar with this problem for many years, going back to the days when I was the Minister of Mines some years ago, and I know the history and background of this problem, and can assure the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the constitutionality of this matter does not rest on the appointment of a commissioner by the province but the case is just the reverse, the curious situation of appointing a mining clerk or judge by the Federal Government, and the payment of that official by the Province of Ontario.

I think there was a very real doubt in connection with that situation, but this is an interesting point of history which

I might explain to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

The present judge is, I presume, entitled to use the designation, under The Ontario Mining Act, which created the position of "Mr. Justice T. E. Godson." He has occupied that position for many years. Judge Godson is now getting along in years, and is, I suspect, considerably over 75 years of age, and on that point there might be some doubt about his continuing, as being beyond the age of retirement of any of our civil servants.

Judge Godson in his time has done very fine work for the province and I would like to recognize that here by stating that he has performed that fine work over a period of many years.

The situation in this connection referred to by the hon. member for Waterloo North arose about 30 years ago, or more, during the time of one of my predecessors, the late Charles McCrae, and arose in this way:

Ontario had a commissioner of mining—I am not just sure of the name, but I think perhaps it had the same designation. At that time, there was some difficulty which arose in relation to the power of the commissioner to pass upon matters relating to patented lands.

I think it has been held that the commissioner can deal with unpatented lands, but that in dealing with patented lands he ran into questions of jurisdiction, and my recollection is that on the matter being referred to the superior courts, the Supreme Court of Ontario for one, it was found to be unconstitutional.

At that time, a curious situation arose, which has existed since then. I believe the Rt. hon. Mr. Lapointe was then Minister of Justice, and the hon. Mr. McCrae was the Minister of Mines for this province. An Order-in-Council was passed, which was a very curious document in itself. The Order-in-Council provided that the mining judge should be appointed—and in fact he was so appointed—by the Federal Government, upon the nomination by the province.

Hon. members will no doubt recall that at that time there were two different administrations in office in Ontario and Ottawa; but in any event, the Order-in-Council provided for the appointment of a mining judge under The Ontario Mining Act. The appointment was of course really made by the then Government of Canada, but the Order-in-Council proceeded to say that payment of salary and superannuation for the judge should be paid by the Province of Ontario. I do not think there was ever a more curious arrangement in the judicial history of this province than that particular one.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the arrangement worked out very well. Judge Godson is, and has been, a very fine official and over a period of a great many years, did very excellent work. However, the situation now arises after some 30 years of operation Judge Godson is now well along in years, and has a very large number of decisions to make—as the hon. Minister of Mines stated here, some 65,000 claims this year—and there are bound to be all kinds of situations arise which would seem to require the employment of a younger man.

We did look at this matter some 3 or 4 years ago with a view to perhaps considering the appointment of a second mining judge. We decided that solution was not desirable or satisfactory at all. As a matter of fact, I do not think the second appointment we considered at that time could have worked.

Since that time we have conducted a very careful appraisal of the cases determined by the judge, and the great majority—I would say probably 95 per cent. or more—so the hon. Attorney-General tells me, are cases which are clearly within the competence of a commissioner, such as we had before, and such as is contemplated in this Bill.

The problem, of course, arises in connection with the residue of perhaps less than 5 per cent. of the cases—perhaps very much less than 5 per cent. It is my understanding that the number of cases which would have to go to an actual mining judge are very small indeed, that



the greater part of the administration is carried on by a commissioner, the appointment of whom this Legislature has the clear competence to authorize, and to appoint through the authority of an Act to be passed by this Legislature.

In considering the other matter, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer) will agree that it seemed to us that the sensible thing to do was to refer those things which would apply to a judge of the Supreme Court. We have discussed the matter with the Chief Justice of the High Court, who has been very helpful in the matter, and is willing to designate a judge of the High Court to be known as the "mining court judge," in exactly the manner that an admiralty judge is designated by the High Court to deal with admiralty matters which, I may add, is purely a federal matter. In any event, a mining court judge would be appointed or designated as the "mining court judge," and to him would be referred the cases over which our commissioner would have no jurisdiction.

I think that will make a very much better arrangement. The run of the mill of these cases should not be decided by a judge at all; they should be decided by a commissioner. The duties of the commissioner are to a very large extent, administrative, and could be carried out by a commissioner, who is also an administrator dealing with the hundreds and thousands of cases that would come before that body.

Matters which are purely federal, that is in the sense that they are not within the jurisdiction of this province to deal with, are very limited, and if they were handled by a Supreme Court judge who is designated to do that particular work, it would mean we would get the continuity which we will require, and a lack of which was one of the difficulties we have had before.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he can assure the House that there will be that designation?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, that is right.

MR. OLIVER: That is definite?

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite definite. We discussed the subject with the Chief Justice of the High Court, and he has been most helpful in that regard, and recognizes the situation. There is nothing to be gained by the Province of Ontario appointing an official and dignifying him with a name and title which we really have not the power to do. We may have the power to create it, but we have not the power to fill it.

It is an arrangement the Federal Government should make. They have the appointment of judges, and I should say with the designation of a Supreme Court judge who would look after these mining cases, we will get an even judgment in connection with the cases across the board. In other words, we will get, I think, the kind of decision we might not receive, if a case was taken to one judge on one occasion, and to another judge on another occasion.

There will, of course, be little jurisdictional difficulties. Those things will arise, but they will soon clarify themselves, and we will be back to the position I do not think we should have ever left. The Province of Ontario should pass upon its own work within the capabilities and powers of the province to deal with them, and the other matters should be dealt with by federal judges, as was indicated by the Act of Confederation.

I think that meets the situation. I wish to assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that with respect to section 115, to which he referred, I do not think there is anything about the constitutionality or the validity of that section, but I think probably there was quite a good deal regarding the validity of what we did before.

This is a matter which we have discussed with the Federal Government, through its Department of Justice, on a number of occasions, and we think this is the proper solution of the matter, and will clarify the whole situation.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject, because I think there is a great deal more in this than meets the eye. I am not certain that the hon. Prime Minister's suave explanation completely revealed all the various facets of it.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member has a suspicious mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I have been told that before, Mr. Speaker, and undoubtedly I shall be told it again.

MR. MALONEY: An evil mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: It is not suspicious, it is "evil"; that is the description now.

I agree with the hon. Prime Minister in this respect, that I do not think the issue we face here is a constitutional issue. However, I think the problem is a real one, much more real than the hon. Prime Minister has suggested, and I think it is necessary we go back for a moment, and take a look at exactly what has happened.

The hon. Prime Minister has given something of the history as to how we have reached this present position, and what the nature of the problem is.

Up until 1908, in the Province of Ontario, all mining claims came before The Department of Mines itself. As a result, the department became deluged to the point that they were overburdened, so in the year 1908, a mining commissioner was appointed. From 1908 to 1923, that arrangement worked out well, but it suddenly floundered on one of those things which appears periodically in Canadian history, on a constitutional decision, on the ruling of a court, which ruled they could not proceed.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): The McLean case.

MR. MacDONALD: The McLean case, that is right, and that is the case which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Waterloo North.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, only in a very limited way. The hon. member will see by the case that it applied only to forfeiture of patent.

MR. MacDONALD: I have looked through the case, Mr. Speaker, and what happened was, the hon. Prime Minister suggested they went to the court and got a ruling, but actually instead a specific case was before the court, and with neither of the parties asking for a judgment, the court went out of its way to give a judgment and to suggest—I shall not read the actual ruling or statement in the judgment here—but it went out of its way to point out that as far as dealing with patented lands, there was some—

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Forfeiture of patent.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, there are a lot of wrinkles in this which the lawyers on the other side may have some fun in trying to tie me up on.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I am not trying to tie the hon. member up at all; I am simply trying to keep the record straight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The McLean case dealt with the forfeiture of patented land, nothing else.

HON. MR. FROST: We are trying to untie the hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: It is really wonderful how sensitive the front benches have become on this issue. Last Friday they tried to "railroad" this thing through.

HON. MR. FROST: No, No.

MR. MacDONALD: Do not let the hon. Prime Minister get too excited, we will find out what is in this case before it is over.

After the decision of 1923, we were forced into what the hon. Prime Minister has, I think very aptly, described

as a very curious and a very unique situation, one in which, to meet the fact that the Mining Commissioner did not have jurisdiction over a very important element of the decisions which were coming before him, but that came within the jurisdiction of federally-appointed courts, they then reached the kind of a "saw-off" in which the province nominated the judge and the federal government appointed him.

Now it is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister tries to construe the unconstitutionality theme and the hon. member for Waterloo North is saying that this whole set-up was unconstitutional, in other words, from the year 1923 to 1956 we were actually working on an unconstitutional basis.

HON. MR. FROST: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not say that at all. I would say a most unusual basis, I certainly would not say it was unconstitutional for this reason, that the appointment of the judge was made by a federal Order-in-Council.

However, it was a curious thing that the nomination was made by the government of the province of those days, but the appointment by a federal Order-in-Council. There is also this curious thing, that there was no payment to the judge by the federal authorities, but any payment he received was from the Province of Ontario, which again is unusual.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps my ears deceived me, but I thought that on at least 3 occasions, the hon. Prime Minister indicated that this was a situation which might be more unconstitutional than the particular one raised by the hon. member for Waterloo North. However, that is by the bye, let us not argue the little points; there are more important ones.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, let us get down to the meat of it.

MR. MacDONALD: This situation went on until 1955-1956, and now we are faced with a Bill which is coming before this Legislature, which asks us

to abolish the mining court altogether. If the mining court were a court which had not done an effective job, then I think there would be some justification for accepting this Bill at its face value. But the fact of the matter is that the mining court has done a superbly effective job, partly because of the nature of the court, and partly because of the man who has been sitting as its judge down through the years.

The hon. Prime Minister made the statement, for example, that there is not anything to be gained by continuing this kind of arrangement. I am not so certain that is the case, because in those cases which come before the court there are some which have to do with patented lands which go before the higher courts, and that is all very well. But the great majority of them—the hon. Prime Minister says 95 per cent.; I would be a little suspicious that is too high, but he may be right—95 per cent. of them are said to be completely within the jurisdiction of the commissioner.

However, if that is the case, it still does not alter the fact that the 5 per cent. which comes within the jurisdiction of the court are perhaps the most important 5 per cent. It is the disputes with regard to patented claims, and, it is this basis upon which the whole mining industry has been established.

If I may try to illustrate to other hon. members in the House, who are laymen in this den of lawyers, including the hon. member for Renfrew South—I noticed he does not even smile now, Mr. Speaker—he has lost his capacity to do so.

MR. MALONEY: I am filled to overflowing with laughter.

MR. MacDONALD: Part of the problem is that we may have, for example, a man who gets a patented claim on certain land, and starts to develop it and, as he starts to develop it—to take one specific case—he encounters the problem of tailings, which is one of the main problems in the industry. How is he going to get rid of them?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That will not be difficult.



MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Attorney-General will have an opportunity to speak later. He will have to get rid of them usually by piping them off onto lower ground. If he starts to pipe them off onto lower ground, he gets them on to another property, and it is likely that this other property will be owned by somebody else who has a patented claim.

How is he going to get some sort of an arrangement whereby it will be possible for him to develop his claim and his mine? If this man who sits on his right on private property says "No," he is in fact frustrated, and if he attempts to get an easement across the property to carry the tailings on to another property, he may have difficulty.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: We do not think so, under this Act now.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Attorney-General does not think so, but I want respectfully to suggest to the government that there may be others who do think so, and that is what we should look into.

What happened was that down through the years, this judge, who was acting in that capacity, deciding legal problems, at the same time acted with a degree of flexibility, taking all the various factors into the picture which is sometimes not possible in a court where you have to stay within the strict rules. On occasion, it was possible for him to see that these private rights had to give way before the over-all public needs, if they were going to develop a mining industry, he would make a ruling, and that ruling would "stick".

That, I think, is the essence of why this mining court down through the years was an arrangement which was a sort of a bizarre one, in terms of the normal set-up, but it still was an extremely effective set-up because it was able to introduce a degree of flexibility within the detailed knowledge of a judge—which is very difficult to get in the case of a judge who is now in the Supreme Court—so he could rule on all the factors in the picture; and, in ruling

on those factors, he allowed the fullest possible development of the mining industry.

So I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that there is something to be lost in abolishing this mining court, and I ask the question, why is it being abolished at the present time?

HON. MR. FROST: Now we are getting down to the meat of the matter; is that it?

MR. MacDONALD: Are we?

HON. MR. FROST: Well, is that it?

MR. MacDONALD: Are we? Was that the hon. Prime Minister's conscience that was speaking there? Well, perhaps we are getting down to the meat of it. This problem which we are now facing is not a problem of the year 1956, it is a problem which has been before us in the mining industry for the past 10 years, because Judge Godson, it is true, is an old man, and he has been an old man for at least the past 10 years.

Therefore, the government has been trying to cope with this problem for a number of years. The hon. Prime Minister indicates that he tried to cope with it 4 or 5 years ago, and found a workable arrangement could not be worked out.

That is one of his suave explanations, because the fact of the matter is that if the hon. Prime Minister could have obtained the co-operation of the federal authorities, he would have appointed the second judge and we would have been able to work a transition from this first judge, who has been in the field both as commissioner and judge since 1908, and would have been continuing with this, which is the best possible arrangement, because it admits of the amount of flexibility which is necessary in coping with these claims and disputes.

But the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, would not "go along", for reasons which I shall not go into at this point. Perhaps some time later we may go into them.

HON. MR. FROST: Do not let the hon. member hold anything back.

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister would be unhappy if I did not hold some of these things back.

HON. MR. FROST: No, go ahead, I have no objections.

MR. MacDONALD: Why does the Federal Government not "go along" with it now? I think that is an interesting point, and one which we should bring into the whole picture. I am still convinced that the government, because of the extremely satisfactory nature of this arrangement over the last generation or so—the hon. Prime Minister now casts disparagement on that kind of assessment—but the fact of the matter is that it has not only been extremely successful in the mining industry, it has been supremely successful to the point that very, very few of the judgments of Judge Godson have ever gone to another court, and even when they have gone to another court, very few of them have been reversed.

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite true.

MR. MacDONALD: So this was an exceptionally effective and practical method of coping with the problem, and on the basis of the practical working out of it, I do not know how one could come to any other conclusion but that this should be continued, if circumstances permit. But circumstances do not permit, because your government bungled the situation, for reasons which are being very nicely covered up at the moment.

Now they are faced with the situation that they cannot get the backing of the Federal Government, because of one of the factors which has emerged on the federal scene, and that is that the Federal Government at Ottawa will not touch with a 10-foot pole a proposition that any judge nominated by a Provincial Government should be appointed by the Federal Government. That is one of

the rights claimed by Premier Duplessis, and if he accedes for a moment that a judge will have to be nominated by the Provincial Government—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about this. That is the hon. member's own statement on this matter, and people will have to take it for what it is worth.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, the hon. Prime Minister knows it.

HON. MR. FROST: I know nothing about that.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, fine; but I would be extremely surprised if the hon. Prime Minister of this province was not aware of that little fact.

HON. MR. PORTER: Where did the hon. member get his information?

HON. MR. FROST: From an anonymous letter, or something of that kind?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Ministers can introduce their little elements of humour.

HON. MR. PORTER: There is no humour about it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know where the hon. member got his alleged facts.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Jolliffe; that is where.

MR. MacDONALD: The situation you have at the moment: is the government trying to escape from a continuation of this court after the fact that they have bungled the situation over the last 10 years? And they are going to end up with a new set-up which—and this is where I come back to the point of the hon. member for Waterloo North—I do not think is a constitutional problem, because if you will take the Bill and read, for example, sections 118 to 121, you will find it was worked out on a pretty ingenious legal arrangement.

I can see that the legal lights in the hon. Attorney-General's Department

have worked overnight and have come up with something like a shuttle service between the court and the mining commissioner, if I may be allowed to put it in horrible layman's language, which results in avoiding the constitutional question which would have arisen. They have a constitutional problem, but they have met it by re-introducing, into these very basic problems in the mining industry, decisions and judgments which will now have to be taken to the Supreme Court.

And in taking them to the Supreme Court, you are going to face all the restrictions of the Supreme Court where, if you overstep some of these rules and restrictions, you get into interlocutory procedure and you find that these people will have to have lawyers in Toronto and they will have to have lawyers in the north, wherever they happen to be.

Now this is going to be all very fine for the big mining companies, but I suggest it contains elements of disaster for the prospectors and the small mining companies. These will find that, instead of being able to go before Judge Godson, who knew the industry and knew it cold, and could settle it, as the record proves, to the satisfaction of industry and everybody else concerned, they are going to get entangled in a court, which may be the Supreme Court of Ontario.

But for many of these prospectors and representatives of small companies, it might as well be the Supreme Court of the United States, it is so far away and so foreign for them to get to and to have the financial means to do so.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my conclusion to which I want to alert the House, is that I think the government here is very slyly sloughing over a situation which is going to create for the mining industry something of incalculable detriment, how much we do not know because experience only will prove that.

But there is something far more in it than the hon. Prime Minister suggested, and for this reason, I will sit down after making this suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister, that now that we have

this out "on the mat," and now that this is going to be referred to the Committee on Mining, I think every opportunity should be provided for people to come before that committee and present their views, and not only should that happen, Mr. Speaker, but that every representative group in the industry, management, the Prospectors' and Developers' Association—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker—

MR. MacDONALD: Can I not finish, Mr. Speaker?

HON. MR. FROST: I have something I would like to tell the hon. member, and I think it is fair that I should tell him. This Bill is not a Bill for the Committee on Mining. I have no intention of referring it to the Committee on Mining. It comes up under The Mining Act, and the hon. Minister of Mines is quite right in saying that in the ordinary course, matters relating to The Mining Act would go to the Committee on Mining, but this is a matter for the House, a matter of policy, and it is not my intention to refer it to the Committee on Mining. I would not want to take the hon. member unawares in that respect; I want him to have the full opportunities of debate which apply in the House.

Might I therefore inform the hon. member that the course will be that this Bill will go into Committee of the Whole House, where every section will be discussed, and there will be the fullest opportunity there to discuss it. I do not think that this type of Bill is a matter for the Committee on Mining.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression—

HON. MR. FROST: I know the hon. member was under the impression—

MR. MacDONALD: Perhaps events will prove me to be wrong—

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.



MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, this is the second time the hon. Prime Minister has risen in his place and interrupted. Is there one set of rules for him, and another for the rest of us here?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. MacDONALD: I shall remember it, because perhaps I shall get up a second and a third time.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member has been doing that all the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: Do not let the hon. Ministers get too excited. There is one set of rules in this House, and the hon. Prime Minister has no more right to rise and interrupt me than I have to rise and interrupt him.

MR. MALONEY: Does the hon. member know the rules?

MR. MacDONALD: Let the hon. member for Renfrew South just read the rules of the House, that is all.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I thought it only courteous to tell the hon. member what I did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was under the impression—and I am under the impression—that the hon. leader of the Opposition thought that when the hon. Minister introduced this Bill the other day, he said it was going to the Committee on Mining.

MR. WINTERMEYER: That is right, he did.

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): I did intend to refer it to the Committee on Mining, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister has now said this is a matter for Committee of the Whole House, and a matter of policy.

MR. MacDONALD: All I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that this is just another little part of the whole strategy of this government, which is trying to "railroad" something through which they are not happy about themselves.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. MacDONALD: They may have gone, for example, as the hon. Prime Minister said, and talked this over with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but have they talked it over with Judge Godson?

HON. MR. FROST: Surely, I have talked with him many times.

MR. MacDONALD: Has the hon. Prime Minister talked this over with Judge Godson?

HON. MR. FROST: Not recently.

MR. MacDONALD: Now we get a correction.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. MacDONALD: The man who knows most about this whole thing has not been consulted in the drafting of this Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: How does the hon. member know?

MR. MacDONALD: I know.

HON. MR. FROST: How does he know? Who told the hon. member?

MR. MacDONALD: Hon. members opposite will learn after a little while that when I get up and make statements, I have substantiated them before I make them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: The government has not discussed it with Judge Godson.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We notified Jolliffe.

MR. MacDONALD: The government has not discussed with Judge Godson this new kind of arrangement, and here is a man who knows far more about it, I say with respect, than all the rest of the hon. members opposite put together.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not blow himself away there.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not being blown away. It is people who are light-weights who will be blown away.

MR. MALONEY: Oh, I am a little heavier than that.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not speaking of physical weight, it is the other kind of weight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: This statement of the hon. Prime Minister, in which he has in effect stated this is not going before the Committee on Mining is an exceptionally important one, at which we have to take a look.

We were assured by the hon. Minister of Mines this legislation was going to go before the Committee on Mining and I think, in view of the problem I have raised, of which we can get substantiation by some people who are very important in the mining industry, that this should be looked at and not be "rail-roaded" through the House, when we will not have an opportunity of taking it to the Committee on Mining and have representative groups from the whole of the industry, management, the Prospectors' and Developers' Association, and even the unions.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

MR. MacDONALD: Certainly.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member stated here a few moments ago that from secret information he had we did not have a ghost of a show of getting the Government of Canada to renew this arrangement.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member said that. If that is the case, does he not think it is a matter of common sense that we should take the next best step of remedying this?

MR. MacDONALD: The government may be forced to, because of the consequences of their own bungling over the last 10 years.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, now.

MR. MacDONALD: That is a very smart and facile comment the hon. Prime Minister made, but if the government had coped with this in the manner in which it should have been coped with, instead of getting up today and lauding the judge, and the actions of this government had been in conformity with the principles we have heard today—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member what it is he wants me to do?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know what, Mr. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. MacDONALD: Agreed. But here is a situation which is a product of this government's action. This government is in the seat of power and therefore they have to find out what the answer is. What I am pointing out is, that all this is not going to be a solution which is going to meet the needs of the industry anything like the manner in which it has in the past.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not have to answer, unless he so desires.

HON. MR. KELLY: I would like to ask a question which might straighten the matter out.

MR. MacDONALD: If it is a question, certainly. I thought the hon. Minister was going to make a speech.

HON. MR. KELLY: I would like to ask the hon. member if he knows that, in all the Dominion of Canada, we are the only province which has ever had a mining judge, and that we are simply getting back to where—in my own personal opinion—we should have been 30 years ago.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I know the spokesmen of the government are all now saying that they want to get back to where they were 30 years ago. But what I am suggesting, and I have said it two or three times already, is that in getting back, they will be going back to a situation which was found untenable in the courts, and are departing from a situation which in the past 30 years proved to be extremely effective in meeting the needs of the mining industry.

HON. MR. KELLY: Not necessarily.

MR. MacDONALD: I say with all confidence, even to the hon. Minister of Mines, that you cannot go out in the mining industry of this province and find anybody who will say that the judgments of Judge Godson down through the years have not met the problems of the industry in a supremely effective way. And all I am pointing out is that the new kind of situation which this government is bringing in, is going to re-introduce into the situation all the legalistic restrictions of a court, which makes it infinitely more difficult to come to solutions quickly and at less cost.

The hon. Minister of Mines shakes his head, but there are important people who may be shaking their heads at him, because I know the thought of many people in this industry, I have talked with people who are interested in the mining industry, about the nature of this deal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we can do, in view of the fact that this government has 84 out of 98 seats, when after promising us that this would go before the Committee on Mining where hon. members would have an opportunity to get some idea of what was emerging in this Bill, and groups across this province who are interested in the subject would have an opportunity to examine it in detail, now we have the hon. Prime Minister come in and, in effect, over-rule his own Minister and say, "This is not going to the Committee on Mining."

As far as I am concerned this is proof positive that the government is trying to "railroad" something through here.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Mr. Jolliffe has the hon. member "loaded" for his speech today.

MR. MacDONALD: It may be true, but the same Mr. Jolliffe happens to know a great deal about the mining industry and happens to be counsel for Judge Godson. He is a man who knows something about the industry. I respectfully suggest this House should not permit this situation to be "railroaded" through, that the promises given in the statement of the hon. Minister of Mines—that this would go to the Committee on Mining—should prevail.

If the government feels it is on perfectly strong ground, it should have no hesitation in referring it to the Committee on Mining, but if it wants to use its vast majority here, in order to "railroad" this Bill through the House, it will be doing the same thing as it has engaged in doing, in the past.

That will deprive the people in the mining industry of an opportunity to look at the situation, and to express their opinion about it in a democratic way, to which the hon. Prime Minister pays "lip service" here.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, as one who, in years past has had considerable experi-



ence in mining law, and who has practiced in the north country for some years, and as one also who has known the present judge of the mining court for many years, and has always had very great respect for him in his position, I would like to clear up one or two points which have not been clear to the House up to the present.

In the main, the purpose of many of the provisions which appear in the mining court part of the Act, as it is today—and that appear in the new amending Act and which appeared before the mining court was established, in the period mentioned, 1908 to 1934—was primarily to obtain speedy decisions on mining matters in relation to unpatented and very often newly-staked mining claims. The purpose was also to get away from the formality of court proceedings and delays, which could be experienced in going through the ordinary court proceedings at that stage, but chiefly, because it was felt that blocking and delaying tactics in the early stages of mining development, in that type of mining land, would tend to discourage development.

With that background, the authority, first of the commissioner, and then later of the mining judge, were set up and made use of. A great deal of the work is administrative, in that it deals with the extension orders for further time, for performance of work, during the first, second, third years and so on, after the claim has been staked, and matters of that sort. It also deals with disputes while the title is still in the stage of unpatented claims, with the Crown in control of the ground, subject to the rights acquired by the staking.

These are practical matters and matters which require a practical man to deal with them. The judge of the mining court was, from 1912 to 1934, the commissioner, and in his capacity of commissioner he learned a great deal about this type of thing. He became so good that it was logical that, when a mining court was established, he would be the incumbent.

However, as applies to all of us in due course we reach the "twilight of life," as is the case now of the judge. Unquestionably, there would have to be someone to take his place when he retired.

The present amending Act creating a commission is, in the opinion of the legal officers of the Crown, completely sound, and there is no reason to expect that it is unconstitutional in any way.

However, for the benefit of the hon. member for Waterloo North, I would like to say that the McLean case, which I have recently read again, dealt only with the question of a forfeiture of a patent on patented land. When the mining court part of the Act was enacted in 1924, there was no thought of giving to the mining court any greater powers than the mining commissioner had before, in that respect.

I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to section 119 of The Mining Act as it now stands:

The Mining Court shall not have power or authority to declare forfeited and void or to cancel or annul any Crown patent issued for lands, mining lands, mining claims or mining rights, but every action or other proceeding to declare forfeited or void or to cancel or annul any such Crown patent may be brought or taken in the Supreme Court. . . .

Therefore, there has been no attempt at any time to give that power to the mining court.

The present Bill before the House is thought to be complete with respect to all the valuable attributes which are necessary. It is felt that with a younger man, in due course appointed as commissioner—who will probably have experience anyway, and who can learn—the same values which have been mentioned here, or which have been available because of the experience of the present incumbent as judge, will be reflected in the experience of the new commissioner.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed very happy to see, on this occasion, that you have returned to your chair. I wish to express my great pleasure at your election to the office of Speaker of this honourable House.

I express these sentiments, realizing and appreciating that you will conduct the deliberations of this House with your accustomed equanimity, and I can only hope that my enthusiasm for debate will cause you no displeasure.

I also take pleasure, of course, in returning to this House, led by the hon. Prime Minister. I noted with great satisfaction on the night of the election, on June 9, that Ontario had used wisdom indigenous to itself in returning to the capable hands of the hon. Prime Minister the guidance of the many and multitudinous affairs of this great province.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that in our interest in lively debates, it can be said when this House has adjourned, that we have taken part, and the part we have taken has been to express not only our own submissions, but rather the sentiments of our tremendous and great people whom every hon. member represents, whatever his riding.

This afternoon I wish to speak until the clock touches the magic hour of 6, on the matter of labour relations in the Province of Ontario, and I do so for two reasons: one, because I represent a large industrial riding and, two, because The Labour Relations Act and The Department of Labour generally have been brought into such controversy, partially by the recent General Motors strike, and also because of the various editorial policies and statements of some of the newspapers in Toronto and other parts of the province.

However, before doing so I would like to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that I am sure he will miss the short speech which I usually devote to his leadership and the policies of the Liberal Party.

MR. OLIVER: I stayed especially for that.

MR. MACAULAY: I am afraid I must disappoint him this time, but I look forward to doing so later on, on another occasion when I can only hope—referring to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie—to fare somewhat better in the great chasms of the memory of the leader of the Opposition.

In regard to the hon. member for York South, who represents a riding which was represented for many years by my father, I wish him well in this House. I am sure every Party, no matter how much sympathy or lack thereof this House may have for it, fares better and performs a greater service in the interests of our people if it has in this House its own leader.

Although my dear friend, Mr. Grummett, who I think was the friend of every hon. member in this House, gave all the leadership of which he was capable, I feel that the properly constituted leader of the CCF Party is more properly in this House. Although I do not agree with him, I do not intend, this afternoon, to devote any time to his speeches, because I have a rather full agenda to discuss. However, I do welcome him here and I will have occasion on which to “lock horns” seriously with him at other times, for it cannot be said I am one of the adherents of his Party.

I wish, first of all, to speak in relation to the Labour Relations Board as it was referred to in two editorials; one in the *Globe and Mail* dated February 13, and the other, contrastingly enough, in the *Toronto Daily Star*, dated February 14.

I believe those were the dates. In any event these two editorials attempt to—and I suggest they do, in fact—point up a great difference in approach towards The Labour Relations Act of the Province of Ontario.

The *Globe and Mail* in its editorial said, in referring to various changes which were necessary in The Labour Relations Act, as follows:

Now, after 17,000 workers have been out for 5 months and have lost some \$1,500 each, it makes even more sense. A Labour Relations Act which permits such destructive stupidity as we have seen in the General Motors strike, needs to be rewritten from start to finish.

That is one approach, Mr. Speaker. The other side of the coin perhaps is to be found in the statement in the *Toronto Daily Star* when the concluding paragraph of the editorial said:

This strike was probably the most dismal failure of collective bargaining in Canadian history. Big companies and big unions had better ask themselves how such wasteful failures can be prevented in future. Unless they find some answers, they will invite a clamour for restrictive laws.

Those are the two sides of the same coin. There are those who say that the Act, as I understand it, should be written in a much more stringent way, to make impossible, I would assume, strikes of the nature of General Motors. There is the other side of the coin as indicated by the *Toronto Daily Star* which indicates clearly, I feel, that the Act is there as a general guide, a direction under certain circumstances, but that the basic responsibility for collective bargaining is between those who engage in collective bargaining themselves, and it is only because of their size that they are unable or incapable of coming to speedier and less calamitous conclusions, than in the General Motors strike, that the government should intervene; by making the Act more restrictive.

Therefore, if I may say so again, there is on the one side the restrictive, and on the other side the more liberal approach. At once I would hasten to say this in relation to The Labour Relations Act. It is administered, as we all know, by The Department of Labour, under the guidance of the most competent, genial and capable hon. Minister.

The other night I had the privilege of having dinner with the hon. Minister of Labour, and discussing some problems with which I was greatly concerned. I can say, further, after talking with him for a short time, I realized how the geniality and his good common sense and his personality must go a long way, in addition to the outstanding services rendered by Mr. Fine and so many others in his department, toward bringing about the very fine reputation presently enjoyed by The Department of Labour of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with The Labour Relations Act, I have several recommendations which I have discussed with the hon. Minister who has been a very patient man. He has heard me out. I cannot say he agrees with any of the recommendations I want to make, but I do not say he disagrees. I mentioned them and discussed them with him, and he gave me the benefit of his understanding of the matter, and I am now giving them to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the hon. members of the House.

In the first place I feel that much of what was published by the *Globe and Mail*, in relation to The Labour Relations Act, is somewhat unfair. With great respect to the *Globe and Mail*, which has had a great and illustrious history and which is, I think, conducted in the interests of the tremendous number of people and industries in this province; nevertheless, they have failed, in the editorial of that date, to take cognizance to some of the really serious problems in connection with The Labour Relations Act.

I hope we have not reached the stage, and hope we never will, when we will say that collective bargaining must be determined by arbitration, and there shall be no room left for negotiation between the parties. I hope we never reach the stage when we put into the Act that collective bargaining, striking, and in short the expression of individual desire—a desire to channel and direct one's own industrial course—are taken away from the people.



I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that in reading that editorial it leaves that suggestion, whereas the *Star* editorial tends away from that suggestion. They are both fine newspapers and I do not criticize them from a political point of view, but rather from a point of view of principle.

I feel that The Labour Relations Act at the present time is being administered partly by the board and partly by the courts; whereas I feel that The Labour Relations Act should be administered completely by the Labour Relations Board. I think the Labour Relations Board takes the position that it is already loaded with work. I am not criticizing the Labour Relations Board for that. I am like the hon. member for York South, who left certain suggested innuendoes today; they were his own, and he was not trying to "tie" them onto anybody whether they were accurate or inaccurate. I am not quoting anybody, but simply putting my own views before this House, because I represent one of the largest industrial ridings, by way of urban people, in this province as does the hon. member for York South. I believe The Labour Relations Act should be administered by the Labour Relations Board *in toto*, and not only in part, with a part left to other sources, such as the courts—the magistrate courts—or to The Department of Labour.

May I give an example of what is dealt with by the Labour Relations Board. They operate under The Labour Relations Act, which gives a definition of "trade unions," "collective bargaining agents," and so forth. The Labour Relations Board certifies who can be the recognized collective bargaining agent. That is one role of the Labour Relations Board.

Another part of the Act says if there is a breach of the Act, the breach shall be heard by a magistrate, upon the consent of the Labour Relations Board. My feeling is that breaches of The Labour Relations Act would be better heard by those who study The Labour Relations Act day in and day out. In fact the chairman of the Board, I believe, is one

of the authors of The Labour Relations Act and is one of the most eminent men in North America in regard to labour relations matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is an example of where one goes to the Labour Relations Board to secure permission to prosecute, but does not prosecute before the Labour Relations Board, but goes outside to a magistrate who—and I say this with great respect—is not familiar with the issues, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, these matters could be better dealt with by the Labour Relations Board than by a magistrate. There are, of course, differences of opinion in regard to that, but that is my own view.

Secondly, I believe there are changes needed in the conciliation routine under The Labour Relations Act itself. I would like to discuss that in this sense, that I want it to be understood that I think the system of conciliation we have had during the last 10 years has been a very happy one. For example, in the year 1953-1954 there was a situation which any hon. members who may have dealt with The Department of Labour will agree is one in which the people of this province might well take pride.

In regard to labour disputes, there were 1,076 applications made to the Labour Relations Board for conciliation services, which means that persons who had entered into collective agreements, or were attempting to renew agreements, work stoppages, and so forth, had asked The Department of Labour to intervene and appoint a conciliation officer to attempt to conciliate the problems.

As I say, there were 1,076 of those applications in 1953-1954. In 485 of those, the conciliation officer was able to settle the problem. May I put it another way, as perhaps my phraseology was an unhappy one; through the intervention of the conciliation officer, 485 disagreements were settled. In only 392 was he unable to bring about a settlement.

The next process, as the hon. members of this House know, is that after you go to conciliation, if a settlement cannot be effected, then a conciliation board is requested, usually consisting of 3 men, one of whom represents each of

the parties, with a supposedly impartial chairman appointed by the department. I do not use the word "supposedly" in a nasty way, but the supposition is that the third member will be an impartial person appointed by The Department of Labour.

In regard to the 392 which the conciliation officer was unable to settle, 134 were subsequently settled after they had gone to a conciliation board. The conciliation officer was brought in again, and effected 134 settlements out of the 392.

Only 258 out of the 1,076 went to the conciliation board, and may I repeat the conciliation board is not a conciliation officer. The board functions after the conciliation officer has had a "run" at it, to try and bring the parties together, and where he is unsuccessful in doing that, then the parties can apply for a conciliation board. Only 258—that is, 23 per cent. of all the disputes in the province—went to the conciliation boards.

I think that is a very creditable record, as it means that 77 per cent. of all industrial disputes in the province were settled between the parties, either with the impartial intervention of the conciliator, such as Mr. Louis Fine, or one of his many assistants.

Of the 258, I believe there were only 85 strikes in that year. Almost all of the 1,076 cases were settled either by the conciliation officer or the conciliation board, and on occasion by the further intervention of a conciliation officer, and only 85 reached the point of a strike.

Eighty-five out of 1,076 may sound high to some people, but not so high to others, but, Mr. Speaker, may I say that 34 of those 85 strikes lasted for less than 3 days, if my count is correct. I may have not counted one or two, but if I err in any way at all, I am naturally apt to err on the conservative side.

This means, in effect, that the number of strikes in the province was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent. of the number of disputes, but, nevertheless, there are certain objections to the conciliation method under The Labour Relations Act of Ontario.

A little later I will refer to certain editorials, referring to the fact that perhaps The Labour Relations Act should be re-written. That was mentioned in an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*. One of the big objections is apparently that the conciliation service is unsatisfactory.

If it is unsatisfactory, Mr. Speaker, I consider it is unsatisfactory in two ways, neither of which is consistent with the other.

Firstly, it is said it is unsatisfactory because it takes too long to get to a conciliation board, and obtain a report from the board. But, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that so long as our Act provides that there is the right to go to a conciliation board and in so doing to ask for a conciliation officer, the request is then screened, it then goes to The Department of Labour which appoints a conciliation officer, who makes his report, and if the parties are not happy with his efforts, they may ask for a 3-man board to be appointed.

There are two parties to the dispute, and I presume some parties have lawyers—even if they do not, the problems are complicated anyhow—but by the time you get 3 men on the board, and there being two parties with their representatives, and you have a hearing which often cannot be held in one day, but drags on a little, inconveniencing a great many people. The problem becomes large, and for that reason I am inclined to recommend that what should be done in connection with conciliation, is that the 3-man conciliation board should be taken out of the Act, as it is now written, and that conciliation should consist of a conciliation officer, who enters into the dispute. Thus conciliation boards should consist of two kinds of people, either specially trained personnel within the department, or recruited from outside, men who have the knowledge of and training in industrial matters.

I have not time to enlarge on that matter now, but I will comment further when the debate resumes. However, it does seem to me that the problem in

connection with conciliation and the objection which many people have, concerns the amount of time it takes, but so long as we have these various channels through which conciliation must travel, the time cannot be shortened very much. It seems to me a cheaper, quicker and just as satisfactory way of dealing with conciliation, when one looks at all the facts and figures, and considers the number of cases which go to conciliation in a year, would be to take away the 3-man conciliation boards.

Mr. Speaker, it being now 6 of the clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, as was intimated last week, we will proceed tomorrow with the second reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to facilitate the introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta, by means of an All-Canada Pipe Line." If time permits, after that second reading, we will proceed with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 of the clock p.m.









# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Second report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....  | 375 |
| Second report, Standing Committee on Education, Mr. Davies .....   | 375 |
| First report, Standing Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Janes .....   | 375 |
| Pesticides Act, 1956, Bill intituled, Mr. Phillips, first reading .....  | 376 |
| Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading .....   | 376 |
| Training Schools Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Foote, first reading .....  | 376 |
| Presentation of report, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 376 |
| Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an<br>All-Canada Pipe Line, Bill to facilitate, Mr. Porter, second reading ..... | 377 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Reaume, agreed to .....  | 411 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 411 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Yaremko, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the committee's second report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 3, An Act respecting the Town of Leaside.

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. 16, An Act respecting United Co-operatives of Ontario.

Bill No. 25, An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District.

Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Society of Interior Decorators of Ontario.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) JOHN YAREMKO  
Chairman

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. M. C. Davies, from the Standing Committee on Education, presented the committee's second report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill with a certain amendment:

Bill No. 56, An Act to establish The Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology.

(signed) M. C. DAVIES  
Chairman

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. C. E. Janes, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, presented the committee's first report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 85, The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956.

(signed) C. E. JAMES  
*Chairman*

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE PESTICIDES ACT

Hon. M. Phillips moves first reading of Bill intituled, "The Pesticides Act, 1956."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This Bill is designed to authorize the control of the hazards to health involved in the use of chemicals for the extermination of pests.

The purpose of this Bill is really to transfer the provisions of The Public Health Act respecting the use of pesticides, into a separate Act, since the provisions relating to the use of pesticides are public-safety measures rather than public-health measures, within the provisions of The Public Health Act.

As a matter of fact, there is practically no new principle involved. It is a matter of taking this out of The Public Health Act and putting it into an Act by itself, to be called "The Pesticides Act, 1956".

### THE SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

Hon. Mr. Phillips moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: There are two significant principles contained in the proposed amendments to this Act.

These principles are, first, authority for sanatoria for consumptives to treat conditions other than tubercular conditions; for example, the amendment will authorize sanatoria to perform chest surgery for conditions other than tuberculosis; and, secondly the extension of the authority contained in the Act respecting compulsory examination and compulsory treatment of persons suffering from tuberculosis. The amendments will require persons in custody to submit to examination and treatment for tuberculosis.

### THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. J. W. Foote moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Training Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to bring the practice with regard to the taking and transcribing of evidence and payment therefor under The Training Schools Act, into line with the practice now followed under The Child Welfare Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

Report of the Ontario Stock Yard Board for the year ended June 30, 1955.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, may I say that we have students from 6 schools in the galleries this afternoon. They are from Port Perry Public School, King Edward School, Olivet Day School, Jefferson Public School, Riverdale Collegiate Institute, and Westervelt Business School, of London. We welcome these students to this session of the House.



## THE NORTHERN ONTARIO PIPE LINE

Hon. Dana Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to facilitate the Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada Pipe Line."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with one of the most vital problems facing Ontario today. The industrial growth of this province has moved forward with great rapidity. Industrial expansion depends upon energy. Of energy there are many kinds. There is energy produced by water power. For the last century the main source of energy has been coal. Coal still represents about half of the energy requirements of the province. The use of oil has increased enormously in the last few years. In the near future there is a possibility of harnessing a new energy resource in the guise of nuclear power. For many years also, in the southwestern portion of the province, there has been distribution of natural gas produced from local wells.

Whereas the population within a 12-year period has increased by 25 per cent. the consumption of energy in all its forms has increased in the same period by about 75 per cent. The day will soon be upon us when, with a continuing growth at the present rate, a shortage of energy resources will set in, and progress will accordingly be limited and cut down. It is not only desirable, but is an absolute necessity that every possible provision be made for access to the people of this province to an abundant supply of natural gas.

At the present time, with the exception of a portion of our supply of oil from Alberta and our hydro-electric power, all the energy supply for Ontario has its origin in the United States. It is, therefore, from many points of view, sound public policy to make provision for the introduction of Canadian gas from Alberta into central Canada.

It is also, we think, in the national interest that the pipe line carrying this gas should be laid within the boundaries of Canada. There are special advantages to Ontario to have the line built

north of the Great Lakes. The potential benefits for northern Ontario in industrial developments and in many other ways are obvious if a supply of gas is made readily available through that part of the province.

Even though a line built north of the Great Lakes will be more costly to build than one passing through certain States of the Union on the south side of the border, this government is of the opinion that it is in the interest of Ontario as well as in the interest of Canada as a whole for this important project to be wholly situated within the jurisdiction of our own country. We think that it is a sound policy to provide for the distribution of Canadian gas through a line wholly within Canada, to Canadians first.

Legislation governing a Trans-Canada pipe line is of necessity unquestionably within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. I may refer to The British North America Act of 1867, section 92, subsection 10, which outlines the exclusive powers of the Provincial Legislature, and which excepts:

(a) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province.

Therefore, any work or undertaking which crosses the boundaries of a number of provinces, can be regulated only by legislation passed by the Federal Parliament. As a Provincial Legislature we have no constitutional power to determine the course of such a line, the manner of its construction or its plan of operation. In exercise of their constitutional powers, the Federal Government have brought about the formation of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company to undertake this project.

Somewhat less than a year ago, it became apparent that this company would be unable to raise the capital to carry out its undertaking. The company approached the Federal Government for assistance. Of course, if the company

had been permitted to build the line south of the Great Lakes, doubtlessly the necessary money might have been raised without difficulty in the ordinary way. It was the added cost of the northern section which became an obstacle to successful financing.

In view of the fact that this direction of the line was imposed upon the company by national policy, a national policy with which this government is entirely in accord, the company felt justified in requesting some measure of financial assistance sufficient to overcome this difficulty.

It was finally decided by the Federal Government that a portion of the line to be known as the "northern Ontario section" running from the Manitoba border to Kapuskasing, a distance of about 675 miles, should be built by an agency of the government, and leased to the company on terms which eventually would enable the company to buy the line for a price that would return to the government the amount of its investment with interest.

The Federal Government approached the Government of Ontario with the suggestion that the company's proposal would be more acceptable if the Province of Ontario would agree to provide a portion of the capital required for the northern Ontario section. In view of the special benefits for Ontario, and particularly northern Ontario, of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line, it was suggested that Ontario would be fully justified in contributing a substantial share.

The position of this government has been this: It is not only highly desirable, but is in fact becoming an absolute necessity to obtain a steady and increasing flow of natural gas from Alberta for the central markets of Canada. We have from the outset fully supported the Federal Government's announced policy that a gas pipe line for this purpose should be wholly built and operated within Canada. In view of the fact that government assistance became necessary to make this policy possible of attainment, we have considered it fitting and proper for us to participate

with the Federal Government in their proposal.

Now it is quite apparent that this whole matter has been the subject of considerable controversy. There are, of course, possible alternative courses of action. We have given considerable study to the whole proposal and the possible alternatives from every point of view. We have had consultants of high reputation advise us on the financial and physical aspects of the project. We have explored others, and what might have seemed to us at the time somewhat more satisfactory ways of approaching the problem.

Nevertheless, we have no power or responsibility of legislating for matters extending beyond our own borders. The Federal Parliament have this power, and it was the decision of the Federal Government to exercise it in the way proposed. They must take the full and exclusive responsibility of a decision which is national in its scope and implication.

A contract was drawn between the Federal Government and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company providing for the northern Ontario section in the manner proposed. We are not parties to that contract. We were not concerned with negotiations leading up to it. It was made entirely upon the responsibility of the government which had the power and authority to deal in the matter.

We share with the Federal Government a common objective, namely to bring gas from Alberta for use in central Canada. Theirs is the responsibility to decide how this is to be done. The Federal Government is the only government in a position to assess the many conditions that are involved in this great national undertaking and the many points of view in other parts of the country.

In the course of development of the Trans-Canada project, a number of controversies have arisen. Indeed no matter how or where the line were to be built, there would be differences of opinion as to almost any decision that

might be made, but there are still several controversial aspects of the present proposal and I shall outline a few of them and point out some of the factors to be considered:

1. A possible alternative, that has met with considerable public favour in some parts of Canada, is that the Trans-Canada Line should be wholly built by government funds. We have considered this possibility with considerable interest. This government is not opposed to public ownership where it may be suitably applied. I think our record substantiates that statement.

Our view toward public ownership is not a doctrinaire attitude. There are projects, which for various reasons may not be attractive to private capital, yet are nevertheless in the public interest. In the report made by Mr. Glassco, of Clarkson-Gordon & Co., a copy of which has been placed on the desks of the hon. members, the economics of a government-built line are given full consideration. In discussing the possibility of a line built entirely by public funds, he recommends that if governments entered into such a project they would get into grave difficulty if they attempted to operate the undertaking.

From the viewpoint of the Federal Government many considerations, which may not be immediately apparent to us in Ontario, arise for investigation. The gas to be carried by the pipe line is a natural resource of Alberta. The viewpoint of that government must, therefore, be respected. In Alberta, expressions of opinion have indicated a considerable opposition to public ownership in gas distribution. Also, the danger of Federal Government interference, if it attempted to operate the pipe line, with the price of gas at the well-head might not be welcome in the province in which the gas is produced.

Yet, in spite of all possible objections of a line built by the government and operated in the same manner, if the present arrangement does not succeed, and there are several loose ends which have not yet been settled, it is always possible that ultimately a publicly-owned

pipe line might be resorted to as the only practicable solution.

2. Considerable discussion has arisen over the proposal to export to the United States at Emerson, south of Winnipeg, on the American border, and further at Niagara Falls.

A study of the Glassco Report will reveal the reasons for these arrangements. In order to obtain the necessary finances, the Trans-Canada Company must show sufficient revenue from the outset to satisfy investors. In the early stages of the project particularly, when the markets in the east are not fully built up, this additional revenue becomes an essential feature of the plan.

In fact, the additional revenue hopes to be gained from the contract of export, at that point and at the other point, will make it possible for the gas to be distributed in central Canada to be at a much more competitive price than if the additional revenue were not available to the line.

Also, in view of the increasing supplies of gas coming into production in Alberta, the markets of eastern Canada will be able to absorb only a portion of the quantity produced for many years to come, mainly from the financial viewpoint, the arrangements for the sale of gas at Emerson and Niagara become an essential part of the deal.

Thus, if the Federal Power Commission of the United States does not grant permission for the proposed contracts to be carried out, some new financial arrangements will have to be made.

Certain criticisms have been levelled at the terms of the proposed Emerson contract. This is a contract of course with which this government is not directly concerned, but I think this House might be interested in some of the facts with reference to it, insofar as I have been informed.

It is suggested that the price for the proposed sale of gas there is too low. This, of course, depends upon the conditions of the contract. There are many different types of contract in connection with the distribution of gas.



The proposed contract at Emerson, I am informed, is for the sale of gas on a take or pay basis. That means that gas is delivered. It must be taken and it must be paid for, with a 75 per cent. load factor for the first 3 years, and a 95 per cent. load factor for the balance of the 25-year term. Naturally, a purchase at such a high load factor which becomes 95 per cent. for the large portion of the term, would be at a much lower price than the ordinary utility agreement.

It is as simple as this: if you have a stove in the house and you are able to turn on the gas at any time of the morning or night and turn it off at any time of the morning or night, naturally you must pay a higher price for the privilege than you would if you had a contract where you were prepared to take a steady flow of gas for 24 hours of the day, or even for 23 hours of the day, or say for 12 hours of the day.

The load factor is always an important consideration, because at certain times during the year a utility receives gas under a contract, and can distribute it, but at other times of the year when it cannot take that gas because there are no customers for it, the pipe line company which is selling that gas must find some other outlet for the gas, to make up the revenue.

Very often they have to sell that gas at a low price, or not sell it at all; therefore, the load factor is always a very important point to be considered in any determination as to whether the price is too high or too low.

The price of gas from the main pipe line would probably depend upon 3 factors. I am not in a position to say whether the price is right or wrong because I am not an expert, but there are 3 explanations for some of the apparent discrepancies of price. It may be that when agreements are finally settled, full explanations will be made available:

(a) The price paid for the gas in the purchase point in Alberta.

(b) The distance from this point to the point of sale.

The further a line has to travel, the more cost is involved in the transportation of the gas, and in the way of capital charges and interest rates, and also in the actual compressor stations and other undertakings which have to be operated.

(c) The load factor.

So that we have the full information about these 3 points.

Definition of load factor:

Load factor—ratio—

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Average daily take of gas through year}}{\text{Maximum day take}} \right.$$

3. Objection has also been raised on the ground that the financial control of the Trans-Canada Company may be to a large extent in United States hands. Of course, with any company that raises capital from private investors, the ownership of shares changes from time to time. It would be quite unrealistic to impose any such restraint upon this company more than another. If this were to be done in view of the national scope of the undertaking, it would be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government to deal with the matter.

If any attempt were to be made to legislate as to who should control the company, there is only one jurisdiction in whose authority that would be, and that is the Federal Government, because this is a matter which is associated with a corporation formed by a Federal Act and within the complete jurisdiction of that government. The important consideration is that, no matter where the actual financial control may from time to time lie, being entirely within the boundaries of Canada, it is at all times subject to Canadian jurisdiction. If the owners of the controlling interests of the company do not distribute gas in the best interest of the public, the Federal Parliament has power to deal with it. The whole project is at all times subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

4. The proposal has also been criticized on the ground that by entering into this agreement, the Governments—

Federal and Provincial—give assistance to a private company. It must be remembered, however, that the necessity for this assistance arises from the national policy which has been imposed upon the company.

Because of the condition that the line must follow an all-Canadian route, some government participation at the outset becomes necessary. Nevertheless, under arrangement between the Canadian Government and the Ontario Government, provision is made for the Ontario Government to recover from rentals the capital advance with interest.

I may refer here to the correspondence which has passed between the Rt. hon. C. D. Howe and myself. This has been laid before the hon. members, and it will not be necessary for me to read it at this time, but I will place it on the *Hansard* table, and it will be included in the proceedings.

#### MINISTER OF TRADE & COMMERCE CANADA

Ottawa, November 21, 1955

DEAR MR. PORTER:

As we have discussed on several occasions, the building by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited of a natural gas pipe line to follow an all-Canadian route from Alberta to the east has manifest advantages for the whole of Canada and will involve very serious financing problems, due to the limited markets initially served and the difficulty of the terrain. These might result in the delay or indefinite postponement of this vitally important project.

I understand that, conditioned upon the proposed line passing through northern Ontario and thus making additional sources of fuel and power available to that area as well as to other parts of eastern Canada, the Government of Ontario would consider limited participation with the Government of Canada in a plan which, it is hoped, will ensure the construction of the proposed all-Canadian line.

To accomplish this purpose, the Government of Canada proposes and intends to recommend to Parliament the formation of a Crown corporation to build and own a 30-inch gas pipe line from the Manitoba-Ontario border to Kapuskasing, Ont., to be known as "the northern Ontario section," to be built in conjunction with the actual building of the adjoining sections and to be leased to Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the agreement between the Government of Canada and Trans-Canada, dated November 21, 1955, setting forth the terms of the proposed lease.

You have indicated, in response to our proposal that the Government of Ontario would be willing, on satisfactory terms, to share, through the medium of such Crown corporation, in the financing of the northern Ontario section of the pipe line to the extent of one-third of its cost, your participation to be limited, however, in any event to a total of \$35 million.

It has been estimated that the northern Ontario section will cost about \$117 million, on which basis Ontario's participation would be its maximum amount of \$35 million. We therefore propose that the capital of the Crown corporation should be called up on the conservative basis of an over-all cost of \$120 million; in other words, that 35/120 of the funds required from time to time by the Crown corporation for the purposes of the northern Ontario section would be supplied by Ontario and the balance by the Government of Canada, adjustment being made in reasonable time before the completion of the section to ensure that Ontario subscribes its one-third share (not exceeding the total of \$35 million) and the Government of Canada the entire balance of the cost of the project.

It is suggested, having regard to the extent of the respective investments of the two governments in the project, that the Government of Canada would be entitled to nominate one more director of the Crown corporation than the Government of Ontario and also, from among these, to appoint the chairman.

It is proposed that the Crown corporation should pay interest and repay capital investment to our respective governments in accordance with the following principles:

1. Interest on the outstanding capital investment of each government shall be payable at rates (related to the respective rates of interest prevailing for outstanding obligations of Ontario and Canada) to be agreed upon prior to the commencement of construction of the northern Ontario section.
2. Earnings in excess of expenses and interest shall be applied to retirement of the outstanding capital investment of each government in proportion to original investment. In the event of sale of the assets of the Crown corporation, the same principle of distribution shall apply.

I would like to make it clear that the Crown corporation will not commence to build the northern Ontario section and that the Government of Ontario will not be called upon to contribute any funds toward that project unless and until the Government of Canada has satisfied your government that Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited is in a position to carry out its commitment to build and put into operation all the other parts of the natural gas pipe line as contemplated by the agreement with that company dated November 21, 1955.

If these arrangements are satisfactory to you, please let me know as soon as possible. This letter and your reply would then constitute an agreement binding upon both governments, subject to implementation by our respective Parliaments, unless and until they are replaced by any other agreement between us.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) C. D. HOWE

#### TREASURER OF ONTARIO

Queen's Park

November 22, 1955

The Right Honourable C. D. Howe  
Minister of Trade and Commerce  
Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR MR. HOWE:

I have your letter of November 21, 1955, and the draft agreement between your government and Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited which was enclosed with it.

It has long been an objective of the Government of Ontario to add to the fuel and power resources of this province, by bringing to the east, by means of an all-Canadian pipe line running through and serving northern Ontario, natural gas from western Canada.

We have given careful consideration to your letter and the agreement, and we are prepared to agree to your proposal and recommend its acceptance to the Legislature.

Accordingly, I wish to inform you that the Government of Ontario is prepared to recommend to the next session of the Legislature that appropriate legislation be passed to authorize our participation in the project to the extent and on the terms outlined in your letter.

We have noted particularly that the proposed Crown corporation will not commence to build the northern Ontario section of the line and that the Government of Ontario will not be called upon to contribute any funds toward that project unless and until the Government of Canada has satisfied the Government of Ontario that Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited is in a position to carry out its commitment to build and put into operation all the other parts of the natural gas pipe line as contemplated by the agreement with that company referred to in your letter.

It is understood that your letter and this reply shall constitute an agreement, binding upon both governments, subject to implementation by our respective Parliaments, unless and until they are replaced by any other agreement between us.

Yours sincerely,

In view of the many and complex aspects of this whole problem, and in view of the growing urgency of the need in Ontario for Alberta gas, and in

view of the great advantages to us in Ontario of an all-Canadian pipe line running through the north, what justification would there be for this government to place any obstacle in the way? In fact, this is a problem which requires the fullest understanding and co-operation. No matter what method might be adopted now or eventually to carry out the undertaking, there are bound to be controversial aspects.

The Federal Government have made their decision as to the most practical method of action under the present circumstances. That is their responsibility. We believe that we are fully justified in giving the fullest co-operation and support financially and otherwise.

This is the purpose of the Bill, but on the other hand, the Bill is couched in flexible terms. If, for any reason the present plan does not go through in its present form, or if it fails entirely, the Bill will permit the government to consider alternatives and advance monies within the stated limits to further any other arrangement that may be adopted.

I shall read the Bill again as I read it when introducing it on first reading. It commences with a preamble.

#### *Preamble*

Whereas the transportation of natural gas from Alberta to Central Canada is a vital necessity to supplement the energy resources available for the continued industrial growth of Ontario; and whereas the carriage of such gas through a pipe line situated entirely within the jurisdiction of Canada and running through northern Ontario is in the public interest of Ontario;

Therefore, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

#### *Loan authorized*

1. For the purpose of implementing the arrangements made or to be made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario to facilitate the construction



of a connecting link through northern Ontario of a pipe line to transport natural gas from Alberta into central Ontario, the Treasurer of Ontario is hereby authorized to loan from time to time out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund any sum of money, but not more than \$35 million, to a corporation constituted or to be constituted on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada and having as a purpose the construction aforesaid.

#### *Commencement*

2. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent.

#### *Short title*

3. This Act may be cited as *The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act, 1956*.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, following the hon. Minister stating the case for the government in respect of this Bill, I have one or two comments to make, and I will do so rather briefly, because we of the official Opposition intend to support this Bill if it comes to a vote in the House.

This Bill was made necessary because of the good fortune in a particular province in Canada. Alberta has enjoyed a flow of natural gas almost without limit, and it has enough for itself and some to spare. Alberta is ready and willing to share its riches with the rest of Canada—or with eastern Canada, Ontario and Quebec—which have not the natural gas which Alberta has in abundance.

Therefore, it seems to be common sense that arrangements should be made to get gas from Alberta to the eastern Canadian market. As the hon. Minister has correctly stated—and I entirely agree with him—this falls entirely within the purview of the Administration at Ottawa, which was not unmindful of its obligations in that regard, and, not only for the last few months, but, in fact, for many months they have sought to make arrangements whereby the Alberta gas could be piped to Ontario and Quebec. They tried, in other words, to

bring the consumers and the producers together for the benefit of both.

Without going into the details which led up to the agreement last November, it can be said, in a word, that at the last conference, or before the last agreement, the Federal Government leased to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company the right to build the Trans-Canada line across this country of ours.

I agree entirely with what the hon. Minister has stated, namely, that we in Ontario should be prepared to make sacrifices in order to ensure that this line is an all-Canadian line. The pride we have in our country is such that we will be excused if we make sacrifices in order to bring about a realization of an all-Canadian line.

As the hon. members are aware, this company could have constructed its line to carry gas to eastern Canada by another route, and a much less expensive route, than the one which has been finally designated. I say it was the proper obligation of the Federal Government to see to it that although the route through northern Ontario was more expensive, they decided that is where the final plans were designated, and where the pipe will go, not only because it will serve the interest of northern Ontario—and that is an important factor—but because it serves to instill in us a natural pride which we should all have in having the pipe line across Ontario from one end to the other.

The particular impact which this Bill has, as the House is aware, is in regard to the 675-mile portion between the Manitoba-Ontario boundary and the town of Kapuskasing. When this Trans-Canada company sought to finance the building of this line, they found it would be difficult to raise sufficient capital if this particular portion of the line was included, and they approached the Federal Government and suggested that, inasmuch as this 675 miles was over a difficult terrain, and in an area which was thinly populated, and where the market was not absolutely assured at the time, there were difficulties in

financing, and they urged the Federal Government to come to their rescue, not in respect to the whole line, but in respect to the 675-mile portion.

I can imagine the Federal Government making an exhaustive analysis of this company's position at that time. I imagine it was convinced there was merit in what the company had said about the difficulties they were experiencing, and I can also imagine that the provincial government of this province, faced with this situation, made an examination and were satisfied there was a need—and a very real need—to help this company, in respect to the financing, if we were going to be assured of an all-Canadian pipe line.

The upshot of it all was, as this Bill suggests and recommends to the House, that the Federal and the Provincial Governments set up a Crown company to build this pipe line, and the Provincial Government has stated in the Bill they will pay roughly one-third of the cost, but not above \$35 million.

From that we take the meaning, that if the cost for the 675 miles amounts to \$200 million, the Province of Ontario is limited in its obligation, as the Bill suggests, to \$35 million.

I will not argue the merits or demerits of this particular move, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me it was the only thing the Federal Government should do when it was met with these obstacles along the road.

The hon. Minister who is sponsoring the Bill in the House suggested a few moments ago that the Trans-Canada people suggested to the Ontario Government that financing on their part would be easier if the Ontario Government came into this picture in a financial way. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to make this remark about that particular assertion of the hon. Minister. I believe quite frankly—and I do not mind saying it to the House—that the Federal Government would have taken unto itself the full financial responsibility for this 675 miles. I believe it would. But, as the hon. Minister said, it was pro-

posed on the part of the Federal Government that the province should step in and make its contribution in this difficult situation.

For once, I am not blaming nor criticizing the present government for what they have done in this regard. This 675-mile stretch is of inestimable value to the people of the Province of Ontario and it seems to me we are justified, in this House, in making provision so that the line across northern Ontario may become a reality. I will not criticize the government, although I do say, in passing, that I believe in the long run the Federal Government would have done the job itself, but it is right and proper, in my opinion, that this province, which will be helped so much by this deal, should come into the picture in a financial way.

The hon. Minister who is sponsoring the Bill stated this afternoon there was controversy as to the various methods which might be employed to build this pipe line. Of course there is. A project of this stature and magnitude is always open to criticism, and different interpretations of various questions.

The hon. Minister suggested—and rightly so—that there is one school of thought which feels that public ownership should have been allowed to build this pipe line. But in its wisdom or otherwise—and I incline to the former—after making an analysis of the whole situation, it decided that what is contained in the Trans-Canada agreement was the best sort of arrangement which could be made at this time.

I would add this, however, with regard to the question of public ownership. I cannot see for one moment that if it is feasible to have public ownership bring gas from Alberta, why it is not just as feasible and necessary that we have public ownership for bringing coal from Alberta, or from the eastern provinces of Canada. It seems to me we cannot have one competing fuel under public ownership, and other types of fuel under private ownership.

MR. MacDONALD: And hydro.

MR. OLIVER: That has nothing to do with the question at all.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes, it has.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member can argue very speciously but I do not think he can argue that.

If we are to apply this to gas, why not to coal and other fuel which comes into this province from other provinces? However, I do not know why we should argue at all this afternoon, because it is, as the hon Minister has said—and I agree wholly and entirely—completely a federal responsibility, so far as this pipe line is concerned.

I do not want to say more on the Bill this afternoon, except that, as far as we in Opposition are concerned, in regard to this particular piece of legislation we will support the government.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in adding a few words to what has already been said in connection with this very important Bill, I might give the House some further background material, with respect to this problem.

I listened very carefully to what the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Porter) had to say, and it seemed to me he covered very effectively and fully the essences of this case, and the reasons which lie behind this Bill which is now presented to this House.

There are, however, some matters to which I may refer. I have had some dealings with the problem of natural gas, and its effects here in Ontario. About 7 years ago, just at this very time, there were very grave difficulties in south-western Ontario, occasioned by a gas shortage which had arisen from war-time conditions, during extremely cold weather, and we were at that time very much dependent upon American sources for relief. The hon. member for the City of Windsor, who was the mayor of that city at the time, will recall that situation.

About that time there was thinking which was rather current to the effect that there could be worked out some

kind of a reciprocal arrangement, whereby gas from the Canadian fields could be sold on the western American market, and that Ontario and central Canada would obtain gas coming from the mid-western states, and the State of Texas. That was in the days before the discoveries of the great gas fields in the Canadian west, which have developed very, very spectacularly since that day. I think it was in 1948 the Leduc well came in, and since that time there have been numerous additions to the oil and gas resources in western Canada.

At the time about which I am speaking, the hon. Provincial Treasurer was then the hon. Minister of Planning and Development, and the matter to some extent was handed over to him, or he had dealings with it. We dealt at that time with Rt. hon. Mr. Howe, as the federal Minister in charge. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we had great difficulty in securing gas—propane or butane—from American sources.

Since those days, the picture has spectacularly changed, and there are now points which would be overwhelmingly adverse to Canada or Ontario under any such arrangement as was then proposed. There has been thinking of that sort on a wide scale in western Canada, and quite properly so, because they are adjacent to large American markets.

Another unfavourable element is that in central Canada—in Ontario—because of the distance gas must travel we are in a high fuel cost area, we would be faced with great problems for we would be at the end of the line if we were relying upon American sources, as every community between here and the Gulf of Mexico would be pressing for priorities ahead of us.

In other words, the great potential of Ontario—and indeed Canada—would be subject to the demands by the people of the United States for service from the gas line.

Mr. Speaker, the second one is one that has been mentioned by both hon. members who have spoken, namely that



northern Ontario would not be serviced. This line could be constructed, of course, and we could, for the time being, get gas from the mid-western States, but for how long? But again, it would cease to be an all-Canadian line, and with that, much of the self-sufficiency in fuel supply which would come to Canada economically would be lost, if we departed from the plan proposed.

The other reason—which I think is a very fundamental one—is the uncertainty, in the long-term view, of American supplies, bearing in mind that presently there are 30 million users of United States natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, natural gas is not a replaceable resource. To place central Canada on the end of such a line would be folly.

That was the proposal some 7 or 8 years ago. Those of us who had to deal with this problem, including Rt. hon. Mr. Howe, unanimously agreed that such a thing was absolutely unsound from the standpoint of Canadian development and Canadian independence.

Mr. Speaker, those concerned in the great growth of the western Canada oil fields and gas as fuel, view this suggestion with great concern, since central Canada would be subject to all of the hazards of decision of the Central Power Commission in Washington and to the demands of the various states, in times of shortages, which would claim priority in the future, as they have in the past.

As the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said, this situation was clarified some years ago—probably 2 or 3—by a decision of the Federal Government refusing export licences, and insisting upon an all-Canadian line.

Mr. Speaker, that decision was undoubtedly in the Canadian interests, and I think that all Canadians will support that point of view.

That decision affords the possibility of processing much of the Canadian raw material which is presently being distributed outside of Canada, partly because of the lack of fuel resources in Canada.

That has been one of our great fundamental weaknesses, the fact that we have not the fuel resources, coal in particular, which other countries have.

As has been stated here, an all-Canadian line is faced with difficulties which are apparent, some of which have been mentioned. There is, first of all, the building of the line through 600 or 700 miles of very difficult northern Ontario terrain; but through a country which has vast potentialities in natural resources. In building a pipe line through that territory, we make it possible for the north country to have a balanced economy, and to gain both in population and in wealth.

The second point, of course, is the second hazard mentioned by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that is the problem of creating markets here in central Canada.

Our markets in Ontario are much larger than some of our people believe. In southwestern Ontario we have a very large gas distribution business. We have many large industries, notably in Windsor, which are based upon these resources. This will give an indication of the manner in which natural gas from the west can fortify our power position, which is very vulnerable at the present time.

The third hazard, of course, was the finding of an agency with the financial strength to do the job. In this last item, hon. members are, of course, well familiar with the general outlines of what was done. Rt. hon. Mr. Howe was able to persuade at least two competing interests—or interests which might have been competing—to come together in the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company. That company was made up initially of at least two concerns. He was successful in getting them to come together. Either of them alone would not have had the financial strength to do the job. Together, there was at the time—and I think there still is—increasing indication that now the company will have the requisite financial strength.

Mr. Speaker, in considering this matter, it must be remembered that,

as has been stated, our province is only one of several concerned. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer has mentioned, our jurisdiction commences at the Manitoba boundary, many hundreds of miles from the source of supply, and under conditions which, of course, involve the transportation of gas through 3 other provinces—Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

As the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the hon. leader of the Opposition have stated, obviously the only partner we could have in this job would be the Federal Government, which is the only agency which could adequately deal with the other provinces, and the vital interests therein concerned.

Those vital interests start with the farmers upon whose lands this gas is produced from the wells and proceeds through the various agencies, companies and organizations from which the gas must come.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say something about the matter of public ownership. Perhaps I should deal with it on a broader basis than that involving only a carrier line from Alberta to Ontario or Quebec. There are some very important aspects to be considered in this province.

First of all, in the Province of Ontario, as has been stated, we accept public ownership as a method by which private enterprise can be stimulated. That is the effect of the great Hydro-Electric Power System in Ontario. We have over many years, in fact, since the turn of the century and perhaps before that, endeavoured to create in Ontario a favourable atmosphere in which private enterprise and individual effort can thrive. That is the basis of our success in Ontario.

May I point out that public ownership, however, is not as widely accepted elsewhere as it is in this province. This morning, the hon. Provincial Treasurer and I were engaged on another matter and were discussing this very important subject.

In other jurisdictions, public ownership is not accepted in the way it is by

our people, and has been by succeeding governments in this province.

As has been stated, in the Province of Alberta there has not, by any means, been the same enthusiasm for public ownership as we have here. In 1948, the matter of public generation and distribution of electrical energy was submitted to the people of Alberta in a plebiscite, and the people by their votes decided against it. It is not our business to refer to that, other than to simply state it as a fact. The people of Alberta can run their own affairs. That is their business. We may be strongly in favour of public ownership here, and be very sympathetic to the idea—and, as a matter of fact, we are—but because we are, we should not insist that another province should accept that view.

That is one of the difficulties of this matter, and one which quite apparently the Federal Government had to face.

Early in our consideration of this problem, going back probably 4 years, we did discuss the matter of retailing gas in Ontario. At that time it was considered by Mr. Saunders, who was then the chairman of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission. In fact it was considered by many of us. It was intensively considered by the hon. Provincial Treasurer and by the hon. Minister of Mines, who were then dealing with the possibilities of this undertaking.

First of all, the things that made us feel unanimously that the province should not engage in the retailing of natural gas—although it may be argued that, being in the retail distribution of hydro-electric energy we could do the other job—was that the matter of the retailing of natural gas is a very highly specialized job.

Natural gas, as the hon. leader of the Opposition says, is a very desirable fuel indeed. To become involved in retailing it would immediately mean we would have to buy out several large operators in the Province of Ontario.

It was quite apparent that if we were going to get into the retail distribution of natural gas, we would have to go to

the places where natural gas is now being distributed, take over several of the large concerns, and others which would involve some in the City of Toronto—which would prove a costly operation, involving expropriation, and all the problems and hazards connected with it.

Every reasonable consideration was brought to bear on that problem, and led us to rule out retail distribution and the purchase of those concerns. We felt it was a matter—having gone as far as it had gone—for private enterprise, and certainly not a matter in which we should become involved.

In the matter of becoming involved in private ownership—and I am not by any means ruling this out, but I want to give a factual background—in the matter of a transportation or carrier line; it could only be done in partnership with the Federal Government, owing to the fact that our jurisdiction extends only to the Manitoba boundary.

That is a different consideration, but we did look at it from the standpoint of Ontario doing the job, from a public ownership standpoint. In that case, it would appear—as Rt. hon. Mr. Howe mentioned in his address to the Empire Club here a few days ago—as if our line would start nowhere, since it would start at the Manitoba boundary, several hundred miles from the source of supply, and end up in distributing gas to private consumers at the other end of the line. From our own standpoint, and not from the standpoint of an all federal-provincial partnership such as may come about, we ruled that out.

If a carrier line through Ontario from the Manitoba boundary to our markets was considered—and in my opinion it would be wholly impracticable and unsound—there again would have to be considered the immense cost involved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you, and through you the hon. members of this House, something of the financial implications of the next 10 years in this province. You must remember if we have to finance this great undertaking, we will have to borrow money on the

markets of the world. I am glad to say that 80 per cent. of our borrowings presently are within Canada, and about 20 per cent. elsewhere.

The portfolios of the financial institutions contain now, and will have to continue to contain, hundreds of millions of dollars of our bonds. This morning I was speaking with the head of one of our financial institutions, who told me that at the present time, his concern has \$10 million of Province of Ontario securities.

When we look at the future, one can see how necessary it is that we should safeguard our credit position. The construction of a line wholly within Ontario—say from the Manitoba boundary to our markets in central Ontario—would involve at least \$200 million, perhaps \$300 million. The northern Ontario section will cost something around \$118 million. One has only to glance at our obligations for the next 20 years to see that, if we can reasonably avoid great financial commitments, it is most desirable to do so.

Reference has been made in this House several times to the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects. On a 10-year basis, these figures are apparent, and we must find money for the following: for hydro, we must find something on the order of \$1.5 billion. Schools and universities are going to require, as a minimum, a further \$600 million on capital account. I am speaking now about the provincial, municipal and commission obligations in Ontario. Highways and roads, provincially and municipally, will require probably on the order of \$3 billion.

Water and sewage is a great problem which will come before this House during this session. That will require another \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years. Hospitals and other provincial institutions will require \$425 million. Miscellaneous requirements, including the requirements of other commissions, the Ontario Northland Railway, loans to various associations, young farmers, co-operatives and subsidiaries of government and municipal commissions, will require probably about \$1 billion.



That makes a total requirement for the next 10 years, in money which will have to be voted by this Assembly for capital account, in the neighbourhood of \$8,000 million—about \$8 billion.

I think the House will agree this is a very formidable charge on our credit.

Mr. Speaker, if private enterprise can do the job, I would say it is altogether in our interest in Ontario, and, indeed, in the interest of Canada, that it should do it.

In referring to public ownership, as has been said by others this afternoon, the bringing of natural gas, oil or fuel from the west is by no means a monopoly. There are competing elements in this matter. It should be borne in mind that gas from western Canada must be sold competitively. If it is not sold competitively it cannot be sold, because people can produce gas for fuel and heat, from other sources. It must be made competitive to coal, oil, hydro, and the unknown quantity of the future, nuclear power.

If it is to be successfully marketed, it must fit into the pocketbooks of the people and it is going to have to meet competition from competing sources. Quite obviously, to build up a market, it has to be competitive; and at a price which is attractive to the consumer, both from the standpoint of price and use. Certainly there is no monopoly given to anyone in this matter. It is another additional competing fuel, to be brought into this province.

I would like to refer very briefly to the final alternatives which were given to the government and which face the hon. members of this House this afternoon. In the material submitted to this House is the report of Clarkson-Gordon & Company, to which we referred, and which probably will be referred to in this House as the "Glassco Report" after the name of its author, Mr. Grant Glassco.

The government did not consider this matter alone. We sought advice from Messrs. Stone and Webster, a great engineering firm, our advisors in relation to hydro matters. We sought advice

from hydro itself. We brought in leading legal authorities in connection with problems involved, including Mr. J. S. D. Tory, and we had, of course, our own sources for advice in the government. We had the advice of Mr. Crozier, the fuel controller, who has been engaged in this problem for years, and as I say, we have had the advice of Mr. Grant Glassco of the Clarkson-Gordon firm. His report is here and is available to the hon. members of this House.

The agreement which has been tabled between the Government of Canada and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer and as the hon. leader of the Opposition have said, was negotiated by the Federal Government. Ontario, as such, was not a party to the agreement. As a matter of fact, I do not think we were consulted in the negotiating of the agreement, until the final stages were reached, as to whether Ontario would enter into the arrangement, and introduce the Bill which is before the House this afternoon. While we were not a party to the negotiations, nevertheless the agreement between Canada and Ontario is evidenced by the correspondence tabled here. The arrangements were in process of negotiation between the Canadian Government and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited. Ontario's position is, and has always been, that we regard the bringing of western gas to Ontario as vital to Canadian independence and Canadian economy. We think there has never been, since the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the great opportunity to do an outstanding job for our country as there is at present.

The Federal Government has, in its wisdom, negotiated the agreement with Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, and no doubt the consummation of this deal was premised upon our participation in the building of the northern Ontario section. I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that when he says probably the Government of Canada would have gone ahead itself, if we had refused to come in, that may be. It was not presented to us in that way.

MR. MacDONALD: More secret information.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know, that is the hon. leader of the Opposition's view of it. However, there were considerations from the standpoint of our province. Undoubtedly, northern Ontario was benefitting, as undoubtedly was our province generally, since we represent half the industry of Canada and have one-third the population. Obviously Ontario should not back away from a proposition of that sort. I do not think we could afford to do business that way.

We have taken a generous view with the Federal Government, recognizing their position in this matter has not been simple or easy. I have no intention here of making it more difficult for the Federal Government to carry its arrangements through. If I did that, I would be doing a disservice to this country.

As has been mentioned here, as in most Bills there are points upon which something else might have been desired. It is no secret that we made other proposals to the Federal Government, but again it is a matter which in their wisdom they have negotiated, and it is the only way of accomplishing our main object. I think the main object is the vital concern of bringing western gas to our province.

The principle involved — and the fundamental principle of this government and of this House to decide—is, will we take this great opportunity or will we let it pass, relegating the entire matter to the uncertainty which would follow the lack of agreement between Ontario and the Government of Canada? That is the question which we have to determine here.

Hon. members of this House might well criticize what is in the agreement between the Federal Government and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited. There are many things in the Glassco Report upon which that agreement can be criticized. It might well be argued that it will not work out. For instance, the Federal Power Commission in the

United States was not helpful at times in the St. Lawrence Seaway problem, and has not been helpful to us on other occasions, and may fail to recognize this matter as a complementary situation. I hope that is not the case, but we have recognized the possibility.

The Federal Government and Ontario, of course, will not go ahead with this agreement which it has made with the Trans-Canada Pipe Line, until there is satisfactory assurance that it will work out. In other words, it has to put the money on the table, and have the means to do the job, otherwise we will not proceed with our part in the building of the line. As Rt. hon. Mr. Howe said in Toronto the other day, "We are not going to build a line that begins nowhere and ends nowhere." When there is something with which to connect up, and we are assured of bringing gas into Ontario, northern and southern, we will go ahead.

I have mentioned there are at least 5 provinces directly interested, and perhaps more. In the 5 I have not included our great partner, Quebec, nor have I considered the Province of British Columbia. There are many interests, including the producers on the farms in Alberta and the large distributors in Toronto. We must recognize that, in working out an agreement with the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, the Federal Government has obviously been faced with many difficulties. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, these difficulties are not small. It was not an easy matter to negotiate the agreement at all.

I do not enter into an agreement with a view to letting a partner down. I think, when we enter into an agreement, it must be wholehearted, and I express the hope that this will work out favourably. There are indications today which are more favourable than they have been at any time in the past.

The third point is: having regard to the matter of the present agreement into which the Federal Government has entered with Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, we have made a very careful assessment of the problems involved, and this assessment is tabled in the

Glassco Report which is in the hands of the hon. members.

Apparently the Trans-Canada Pipe Line agreement provides for the quickest and most effective way of bringing gas to Ontario. I think the Glassco Report, and the investigations made by our own agencies, show that in connection with an all-Canadian pipe line, owned and financed by the governments concerned, federally and provincially, there could be at least 4 provinces which would occasion delay—as set out in the Glassco Report—if indeed agreement among the 5 governments could be reached.

That, of course, is a very tangible point. Ontario and the Federal Government have arrived at an agreement as is evidenced by these letters. I would not for a moment say that a similar agreement—or any agreement in fact—might be arrived at if you brought 5 provinces into it. That is one of the problems that must be considered.

The question arises and which may well be asked here this afternoon is: If the present Trans-Canada agreement falls down—and it might fall down, we have to face that possibility—is such a wholly-owned public all-Canadian pipe line—that is, a transportation line from some point in Alberta to Ontario and Quebec—feasible? I can say our best advice is that it is, and the Glassco Report tabled here says that it is.

Quite obviously if the Trans-Canada agreement falls down, there will have to be a re-assessment of the whole problem. We have in the information placed before this House provided at least one alternative, and that is a publicly owned line. The question may be asked here: If the Trans-Canada agreement falls down—of course if it falls down, remember that the Federal Government is our partner—will the Federal Government have to negotiate another agreement with some other private interest or some other combination of interests? We cannot act without the Federal Government, it is impossible; it is outside our jurisdiction to do that. But if it gets down to a point where the

Trans-Canada Line falls down, would we then participate in a publicly-owned carrier line from Alberta to Ontario? I would say the answer is “Yes”, although I cannot over-emphasize the great commitments we have already made, and I certainly express the hope that such participation will not be necessary.

I do not view the future lightly. The problem of the next 10 years of getting \$8 billion of new money is, of itself, large enough to lead us to hope and wish that we might be relieved from too much public financing. That is a huge sum of money which puts in to the background all our previous financing in this province. I assert that the building of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line as an all-Canadian pipe line is in the interest not only of this government but of this continent. I express the hope now that interests in Canada and the United States, upon which the success of the Trans-Canada agreement depend, will agree with despatch to the present proposal, and allow the pipe line to proceed.

However, I say, in the alternative, we are committed here in Ontario, and we are committed federally and by the wishes of all of the people of Canada to an all-Canadian line. If the present arrangement falls through, we are satisfied that the project of an all-Canadian pipe line will not fall through, and that it will be done, whether it be done with privately or publicly-owned money. I am satisfied the Canadian people will not allow it to fall through.

In relation to an all-Canadian line: the great objection to an all-Canadian line in Canada, built in Canada, bringing a Canadian resource from one part of Canada to another, I have no doubt, as has been said here this afternoon, that it may be easily proved that if this line were brought through the United States and the northern Ontario line were abandoned and pushed aside, and the idea of an all-Canadian pipe line were abandoned, perhaps in the future there might be much less expense to central Canada, but it would be a very foolish view to take.



Since the very beginning of this country we have recognized there is a price to pay for Canadian independence. If we had not recognized that, certainly there would be no Canada today. In addition to what has been said about the control of this company, whether the Canadian shareholders have the opportunity to take 51 per cent. of the stock, or anything of that sort, the fact of the matter is that the construction is in Canada, wholly within the jurisdiction of our country, and is subject to the legislative enactments not only of the Government of Canada, but of the provinces through which it passes. That in itself is the real essential of control.

In days past we have invited foreign capital here. We have invited capital from the United Kingdom, from the United States and elsewhere in the world, and I may point out to the hon. members of this House that the development of Canada has been dependent upon the attraction to this country of capital from elsewhere.

I was very much interested—as I think I have mentioned before in this House a year or two ago—in attending the 100th anniversary of the Toronto Stock Exchange. In listening to the history of that great Exchange, which is now one of the greatest in America, and located in one of the greatest financial areas of America, in our City of Toronto, I was interested in the references made of 100 years ago, and the men of those days, about the lack of credit in Canada, that money was going from the United Kingdom and Europe to the great investment areas of the then growing United States, the new country, and was by-passing Canada. One of the things that has helped to make the 20th century our century is the fact that the money markets of the world have turned their attention to our country.

Do not regard the fact that money comes here in large quantities as any deterrent. That is what has made and will make the wheels go around. Foreign capital is present in Canada in fabulous amounts, coming from various parts of the world, the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries. We

have a reputation in this country for fair dealing.

I said a moment ago that this pipe line is under the jurisdiction of Canada, subject to our legislative enactments. So are the great developments of this country which can be seen far and wide. They are in this country, because they know that Canada will treat capital from elsewhere fairly and justly, and may I say to all hon. members that we intend to maintain that reputation. The coming here of these vast sums of money, the coming of industry from other countries to Canada, have all added to Canadian independence, to our self-sufficiency as a nation, and this we intend to carry on.

Bringing to central Canada and utilizing Canadian gas and oil is one of our greatest opportunities, one which a dozen years ago we did not think existed, and in this Bill—"The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act"—as placed before this House, there will be found an opportunity for expansion by the people of Ontario, an opportunity which is ours today.

As the hon. Treasurer has said, it has been a matter of some controversy and many different points of view. I have been interested in the different points of view as expressed in the various newspapers in this city. I have read all the articles, editorials and comments with care, but in connection with the great possibilities and opportunities which will be afforded, the time must come when a decision will have to be arrived at and we should not adopt the attitude of insisting upon this or that. If we do adopt that attitude, we will not make a satisfactory arrangement. I think the present arrangement provides for the fulfillment of a great opportunity which is before our people.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I begin by, in effect, stating my conclusions with regard to what is likely to happen amongst the CCF group in voting on this Bill. If it becomes evident that this is the only way by which we can bring to northern Ontario what is perhaps the most vital need at the present time,

we shall support it. But we shall support it with very, very grave misgivings, which I must assure hon. members, Mr. Speaker, have been strengthened as a result of the highly rationalized and tortuous explanations from the government benches today.

MR. MALONEY: Well, well.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I thought it was very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I think the most interesting thing about this whole issue at the moment is that the government's policies and principles today are at least a partial, if not a complete reversal, of what they were a year or two ago. That is quite a feat, even for a "Tory" government.

I was rather interested in listening to the hon. Minister sponsoring the Bill make the statement to the effect that they are not doctrinaire opponents of public enterprise.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MacDONALD: If I may quote one or two passages to show you how things have changed in the past year, I would like to refer to *Hansard* of March 19, 1954, when the hon. Minister was asked if he would attempt to have the Federal Government change the approach from private to public enterprise, here is the hon. Minister's reply:

I do not intend to ask them. I have no intention of asking them. It is their decision, and as far as I am personally concerned, I agree with it 100 per cent.

There was the doctrinaire statement.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what I said, and I would repeat it if I were speaking under the same set of circumstances today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: A set of circumstances can be assessed in terms of the basic needs of the Canadian people, and is not evolved in questions of tortuous changes.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is a doctrinaire, now.

MR. MacDONALD: May I refer again to the *Hansard* of March 19, 1954. The hon. Minister said:

I believe in free enterprise—

HON. MR. PORTER: That is right. The doctrinaires are on the march again.

MR. MacDONALD: Then the Minister added:

Who built the original Trans-Canada railway? Was it the State? No, it was private enterprise; it was built with men who risked their own money.

I found a little spare time over the Christmas holidays, and I read the magnificent story of Sir John A. Macdonald, written by Mr. Donald Creighton, and at page 294, there is a quotation to this effect—I do not know what school the hon. Provincial Treasurer attended, but I have a grave suspicion that the history books he read had been screened by a committee of chambers of commerce—but examining the two quotations, I noticed, first:

But McIntyre and Stephen demanded a cash subsidy of \$26.5 million, and a land grant of 35 million acres.

Then, a little bit later, on page 299 there is this comment:

The Stephen-McIntyre syndicate offered to build the railway for a cash subsidy of \$25 million, and a land grant of 25 million acres.

That was after the collective bargaining had gone on. They had collective bargaining in those days, apparently. But it goes on to say that they offered to build the railroad for a cash subsidy of \$25 million and a land grant of 25 million acres, and then Sir John A. Macdonald, who was about to sail on one of his many trips abroad, cabled to Mr. Rose, the Canadian High Commissioner in London, and said: "The best terms we can get are \$25 million cash and 25 million acres."

HON. MR. PORTER: What is wrong with that?

MR. MacDONALD: The Minister cited that as free enterprise. Why does the hon. Minister rise in his place and talk about "doctrinaires" and about "private enterprise" when practically nothing at all has been built by private enterprise in this nation. It has been built by money coming in, and from subsidies, or by putting up a tariff wall, so the whole of the Canadian people "kicked" into it. This doctrine of free enterprise is just so much—

MR. MALONEY: "Hooey".

MR. MacDONALD: Is that the best word the hon. member for Renfrew South can suggest?

MR. MALONEY: No. I would call it "MacDonald's malarkey."

MR. MacDONALD: I expected the hon. member for Renfrew South would come up with some of his "barnyard humour."

I now return to this book on Sir John A. Macdonald. We are dealing here with the principles of the Bill, and I think we should take a hard look at them, because it is one of the saddest things imaginable that when we wanted to build our railway, we had the men, who had the "know-how," who were willing to go out and build it. Today this great nation of ours, about 75 or 80 years later, and much more powerful, stands helplessly and pathetically relying upon the resources of a neighbouring State, in terms of "know-how" and in terms of men, to the job.

MR. MALONEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the CCF Party did not make it too powerful.

MR. MacDONALD: Then there is a comment which appears on page 301 of this book, in which the author was referring to McMullen, and what he described as "his conspirators" who were trying to "rook" Canada in this railway deal. He said:

In fact, of course, Stephen, Smith and Angus were not American railway men attempting to invade Canada, but Canadian railway men who had successfully invaded the United States.

A rather remarkable thing, and I think it is worth pausing to compare these two citations. The other day the hon. Minister of Mines rose in his place—and I can understand how through force of habit he pays great tribute to the cause of the Conservative Party, and to Sir John A. Macdonald—and referred to northern Ontario in a boisterous—almost a pre-election—speech.

When he was speaking the other day, I asked the hon. Minister if he had read Judith Robinson, and I think we should bring her into this. Judith Robinson wrote a column after the leaders had made speeches in the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, at Ottawa, in which she said:

Weep, for the CCF has stolen the Tories' smallclothes and lifted Sir John A's fur-collared overcoat from the rightful heirs.

Not George Drew, leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, but M. J. Coldwell, leader of the CCF Party, put the authentic Canadian finger on the St. Laurent government's soft spot in the first day's debate on the Speech from the Throne. Try these over on your political consciousness; all are quotes from Coldwell:

I do object to and I fear; and I believe the vast majority of Canadian people will agree with me; the vast power of huge American corporations in the Canadian economy, and hence . . . in our political life. . . .

I think it has become a danger . . . United States direct investment in Canadian companies has more than doubled since 1945, climbing from \$2.3 billion to \$5.7 billion in 1954. Of capitalization in Canadian industries almost 50 per cent. must be credited to United States sources. . . . How much larger may this figure grow before we shall have lost effective control of our destiny?



Then a little later, she goes on to say:

We in this country must face the effect that this policy will have, not only on our trade . . . on the very independence of our country. I suggest this not in any narrow spirit but from a profound conviction that this Canadian experiment on the North American Continent has something to offer the world; something that would be lost if the Canadian voice became merely an echo, which it has been all too frequently, of the larger louder voice of the United States. . . . Thus M. J. Coldwell. If you thought you heard a ghostly "Hear! Hear!" issuing from an office window in the old West Block you might not have been so far wrong. The spirit of Sir John A. is still about the place.

What I want to suggest to this House is they take a look at what has gone on in connection with this pipe line deal, and is, I feel, what will happen in the future of this Canadian nation, but that is a point which has been very nicely irrationalized out of the picture, by the explanations we have had today.

Let me add, before I leave this point, that I agree with the hon. Prime Minister when he said, for example, that the Canadian nation has been built on capital coming from other countries, and if we are going to develop this nation, we must have capital. If, perchance, our Canadian private enterprisers are not willing to do the financing, then there is no reason to object to capital coming from the other parts of the world. But the point we have to face is that for some reason these red-blooded, hairy-chested private enterprisers of Canada, who like to give you the appearance of great strength, are in reality, actually among the most timid group of capitalists in the world.

Who is building this nation at the present time in terms of significant things? Where did the capital for Kitimat come from? From the States. Where did the capital to develop Ungava come from? From the States. Where will the capital for providing this pipe

line come from? It will come from the States. How come the people of Canada, in the days during the war, discovered they could secure capital when they needed it? Why should we now have to depend completely on American capital coming in to do the job?

That is another very interesting aspect of the whole question at the present time. I want to suggest to this House that has happened all down the line. You cannot object to American capital coming in, if Canadian private capital will not do a job, but it then becomes the bounden duty of the government to make certain that the interests of Canada are protected when the American capital does come in, with its avowed purpose of making a profit.

My statement to this House is that the Canadian Government has not done that; in fact, what the Canadian Government has done in this issue is to "sell out" all along the line, so that the interests of Canada are becoming secondary in the whole picture.

MR. REAUME: In what case?

MR. MacDONALD: Let me give the hon. member a case. In the first instance, this franchise was given to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, which, in the first instance, was the product of a "shot-gun wedding" officiated at by Rt. hon. Mr. Howe. To begin with there were two American companies squabbling to get the franchise. However, they were forced to get together, and Rt. hon. Mr. Howe went to them—as indicated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the hon. Prime Minister, with several of the hon. members and even a few hon. members of the "Tory" Party, who said: "We are in favour of an all-Canadian pipe line, but we want it developed as an 'All-Canadian pipe line,'" and all the rosy promises the promoters of this pipe line peddled across this nation 3 or 4 or 5 years ago was to the effect that it could be done by private enterprise. Those were the two basic promises upon which the franchise was given for the Canadian pipe line.

What has happened since then has been virtually a breach of contract. They have "welshed" on both of those promises. That in itself is bad enough.

But what I want to condemn as even worse is the fact that our government at Ottawa has been willing to "go along" with those who breached the contract, and pick up the pieces once again.

Why in Heaven's name, I ask, when a company says they could build this line, and is given a franchise on that basis, should the government stand back helplessly when this company says, "We will build the line in the area where it is profitable, but will not build it where it happens not to be profitable"? Why, instead of making them stick to the contract on the basis upon which they secured it in the first instance, does the government take it back, and say "We will build the line in northern Ontario and build it out of the public purse; the public purse will build it and underwrite the profits of the company," which is largely an American company, with only one or two Canadians who are the "front people" in the situation. That is part of the answer to the hon. member for Windsor, who wanted to know why.

MR. REAUME: There are other parts to be built.

MR. MacDONALD: I will come to that. We started out by an amalgamation of two companies which were basically American. When they could not cope with the situation, they brought in a third company, the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, and it was indicated a week or so ago in the *Financial Post* for February 18 that what, in effect, has happened, is that 3 major United States corporations have taken over 51 per cent. control, and have put up \$8 million cash, namely, the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, the Gulf Oil Company, through the Canadian Gulf, and the Continental Oil Company, through the Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas Company.

They were no more a Canadian company than anything.

The hon. Prime Minister says, "But what we must bear in mind is that even though this happens to be a company controlled by American interests, we have jurisdiction over it, it lies in Canada, we can lay down the rules and regulations." The fact of the matter is, however, that we have already had clear-cut evidence that when this company lays down the law, and puts its foot down, the government obeys the company, rather than the company obeying the government.

I want to recall what I think is one of the most shameful chapters in Canadian history and part of this whole proposition, and it is that about a year ago, after the endless negotiations which had gone on, as a result of which some sort of agreement was made between Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited and the Federal Government, both the Federal Government and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company were happy. They were content to accept this agreement. Then the president of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited took this agreement back to one or two of the constituent companies, amongst them being the Gulf Oil Company of the United States. It is interesting to note that only 35 per cent. of the gas was to go to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line, yet this one company was able to say, "Nix". They vetoed the whole proposition. The fantastic thing is that this one company, an American corporation, was able to collapse this whole achievement, so they were able to postpone the building of a trans-Canada pipe line by one year and perhaps by two or three years.

If the hon. Prime Minister will not charge me with bringing in a little more "secret information", I will say I have discussed this with some of the boys in Ottawa, whom I have known very well in the past, when I happened to walk in those circles. My information is that on one occasion, when this happened, Rt. hon. Mr. Howe who, whatever may be his faults, at least has a hard-hitting directness when he has a problem—got on the telephone and called the president of the Gulf Oil Company, somewhere in Texas, and, in

the fashion Rt. hon. Mr. Howe was capable of adopting, "burnt up the lines", and told them exactly what he thought of them. What was the answer? He was told—to reduce it to a very short sentence—"You just go straight plumb"—"go where you like."

HON. MR. KELLY: Who tapped the line?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know who tapped the line. I am sure it is accurate information.

HON. MR. PORTER: Did the hon. member not assure us it was accurate information?

MR. MALONEY: Is it the same as in the case of the Children's Aid Society?

HON. MR. PORTER: Is that what was said—"Go plumb"? Is that what was actually said?

MR. MacDONALD: He was telling him where he could go.

HON. MR. PORTER: Then the statement is not accurate?

MR. MacDONALD: I said it was a summation.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member said he was giving an accurate account.

MR. MacDONALD: Here is a senior Minister of the Cabinet, responsible for attempting to build what is going to be one of the major projects of the twentieth century in Canada, for a development in the economic life of this country of profound significance to that future economic life, and after having reached an agreement, the Gulf Oil Company in the United States is able to knock the whole agreement "into a cocked hat"—

MR. MALONEY: That is all hearsay.

MR. MacDONALD: Why? Because we all know that this company is one of the incredibly doctrinaire exponents

of free enterprise, and they will have nothing to do with any deal in which a government is involved. That is a world-wide policy. If they permitted it to be breached in Canada, they may have to permit a breach tomorrow in Saudi-Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that this is something which he should look into. Here in Ontario, presumably, we have jurisdiction over this development. We have had this in many instances, this being the most dramatic and most shameful. This is an example of the things being carried out, not by the elected representatives of the Canadian people and by the Canadian Government, but by the people who happen to be in these various corporations.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Alberta, as I understand it, not only is it the policy of the government, but also the policy of the people, as expressed by their votes, that they do not want public ownership. This is not confined to big or little interests, it is the view of the people there, and we should recognize and accept it.

MR. MacDONALD: I am glad the hon. Prime Minister has raised this point, because I could not help thinking that his argument might be put in reverse, to refute it.

If the people of Alberta want private enterprise rather than public enterprise, that is alright, but why must that become a yardstick to guide our action here in the Province of Ontario?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: Because they own the gas.

MR. MacDONALD: Because they own the gas does not mean to say that we must have private enterprise in the Trans-Canada pipe line or even in the distribution system.

If the people of Alberta want private enterprise, let them have it, but that does not mean that we have to allow our policies to be dictated by their likes.



HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in referring to the people of Alberta, and to policies in the past, I by no means want to transgress upon their affairs. That is the way I understand the situation. I do not think it is for me or for other people to transgress upon the feelings of the people in other provinces, and I do not think it would make for good relations. I prefaced what I said by referring to what had taken place in the general election of 1948, when this whole matter was before the people.

MR. MacDONALD: By the same token, let them not transgress on what we want to do, nor use that as an argument why we must choose private enterprise instead of public enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary for us to take a look at two or three of the results, in order to see the situation into which we find ourselves with this company, so that we may see the situation which has emerged.

I want to draw attention to two or three clippings from people in Ottawa who have been following this matter in a very careful manner. They are newspaper men. I have here for example one clipping, an article which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* by Charles Woodsworth, in which he deals with a very interesting aspect of the matter.

He deals with the time when the Trans-Canada Gas Company came into the set-up. There were really 3 companies involved, rather than 2. The Tennessee Gas Company is an \$826 million giant in the United States. When they got in, they began to act as though they were controlling and dominating the whole policy.

I recall one other clipping in which there was a statement on this aspect of Trans-Canada development, which was announced by the president of this company, H. Gardiner Symonds, in Philadelphia. I recall the newspaper men in Ottawa expressing some surprise at the fact that there was this announcement in regard to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company, coming from the president of a constituent corporation in Philadelphia.

In regard to the other occasion, I have this clipping on the subject. This was the speech by H. Gardiner Symonds who was reported as saying that Tennessee did not seek more than a 50 per cent. interest in the Trans-Canada Pipe Line. As a number of other American companies have financial interests in Trans-Canada, this alleged statement appeared to be in sharp conflict with an assurance given earlier by Trade Minister Rt. hon. Mr. Howe, that more than half of the common stock of Trans-Canada will be available to Canadian investors.

Therefore, the whole of the control of the company by the Tennessee Gas Company is clear now, in the statement which was read earlier from the *Financial Post*, that it has been handed over "lock, stock and barrel." It is, therefore, a moot question as to what degree of Canadian control remains at all.

What is the net result? The hon. Prime Minister has referred to one result.

Here is another article by Charles Woodsworth in which he points out:

Before Tennessee's entry into the picture, Trans-Canada was teamed up with the Northern Natural Gas Co. of Canada, which planned to pipe Alberta gas for distribution in the Minneapolis area. The contract signed at that time between Trans-Canada and Northern Natural called for the delivery of gas at Emerson, on the Manitoba border, at 30 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. Since Tennessee came in (ostensibly to bail Trans-Canada out of its financial difficulties) the proposed price at the border has been dropped from 30 to 25 to 24 cents—a difference that over the 25-year period would mean a reduction of some \$100 million in Trans-Canada's income.

The hon. Prime Minister gave a long explanation—or perhaps it was the hon. Provincial Treasurer who gave it—that there were variations in the contracts. I suggest that this significant fact cannot be argued out of the picture, that is, as happened in this instance and earlier in

the Trans-Mountain Transmission Company, on the West Coast, the price at which natural gas is to go to the United States is being dictated by the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

In both instances, the original contract specified a price of 30 cents and when that was found acceptable, the Tennessee Company came in and forced a change. Then it was cut down to 25 cents, and then to 24 cents. The net result is that one of two things has to happen—either the Canadian producer of natural gas has to get less or the Canadian consumer has to pay more for the product, because of the fact that it is being sold at these bargain rates in the United States.

And yet we have had many, many comments coming out of Ottawa pointing to the fact that what was happening is that the price of natural gas is, in effect, going to be based on decisions of the Federal Power Commission in Washington. I suggest to you that is something at which, if we really believe we are going to have control of this and are going to shape the development of this company so as to meet the needs of the Canadian people and get the cheapest possible price of gas for the development of the Canadian economy, we have to take a look, and which we cannot ignore.

Then there is another point, and I have here another recent article, February 16, once again it is Charles Woodsworth in the *Toronto Daily Star*. If he is correct—and I have no reason to believe otherwise—this is of supreme significance to the Province of Ontario. It reads as follows:

American backers of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Co. are deliberately slowing the development of markets for natural gas in eastern Canada in order to promote their main objective at the western end of the project—acquisition of the right to sell Alberta gas in the bigger and more lucrative U.S. market.

Pipe line experts here point out that Trans-Canada, whose policies are now being effectively directed by

its American partner, Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, has made little effort to sell gas for future delivery to industry in eastern Canada.

HON. MR. FROST: It is all part of the same application.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is all part of the same deal.

MR. MacDONALD: It may be all part of the same deal, but the fact of the matter is that no mention has been made of it.

HON. MR. PORTER: No mention, where?

MR. MacDONALD: No mention has been made by Tennessee Gas Transmission Company of this aspect of the thing, as they presented their case to the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

HON. MR. PORTER: Well, the whole thing is one deal.

MR. MacDONALD: What Mr. Woodsworth is pointing to—

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not know what Mr. Woodsworth is pointing to. There is no secret about it; everybody knows about it.

MR. MacDONALD: The significant part is that they are referring only to the export of gas at Emerson, and are saying nothing about the agreement for the export of gas at Niagara. Mr. Woodsworth says in this connection:

Moreover, in its application now before the U.S. Federal Power commission to import western Canadian gas into the United States through the Manitoba border town of Emerson, Tennessee has made no mention of its undertaking (with Trans-Canada as partner) to export 100 million cubic feet per day of Alberta gas to the United States through Niagara.

HON. MR. PORTER: Niagara is a different type of contract.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member perhaps is comparing two different things. This has not been a vital consideration with us, we want gas in Ontario and these other, ancillary things are all in addition to it. They are things which make it possible and feasible and easier for us to get gas at a price.

May I point out to the hon. member that my understanding of this is that the export of gas at Emerson at a rate of 200 million cubic feet a day is a permanent export, and upon that will be built loads and capacities in the United States for 24 years.

MR. MacDONALD: And Niagara is temporary—I agree.

HON. MR. FROST: And Niagara is temporary, its purpose is to assist us to build our line here.

MR. MacDONALD: Agreed.

HON. MR. FROST: And therefore it may be that the emphasis as to what would be placed, I presume, before the Federal Power Commission on the portion to which American interests are going to look for a permanent supply in the west. The other is an arrangement which, as soon as we take up the capacity, can cease.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not want to dwell longer on the over-all picture, other than to sum it up in this way, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that I think we should get down to what is of pertinent interest in the Province of Ontario.

HON. MR. PORTER: I should think it was about time.

MR. MALONEY: Certainly they will not have to import much of which interests York South, anyway.

MR. MacDONALD: I think the hon. member for Renfrew South has worn that theme out.

MR. MALONEY: Well, it is true.

MR. MacDONALD: The point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to emphasize in concluding my comments on the broader picture of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited is this, that it became very clear early in the development of this project in Canada that the American promoters are not interested in building a line to meet Canadian needs.

The American promoters of Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited, and the people who control the company, are primarily interested in bringing natural gas into the Province of Manitoba, getting it across the American border into the mid-west area, and then across into the eastern portion of the United States, and, particularly, the lucrative New York market.

Whether or not we build a pipe line through northern Ontario they do not care two snaps of their finger, that is why they dropped the proposition and that is why I think it was a very "weak-kneed" attitude for the Federal Government to accept their dropping it and come in on an alternative arrangement. When it was part of the original bargain, they should have had to carry it out.

But the significant thing is that the revelation of all these developments shows what are the real intentions and interests of the people who today control that company.

What I want to suggest, as I move now into the consideration of the "northern Ontario bridge," so-called, details of which are to be found in this report of Mr. Glassco's which has been provided for us here, is that in too many different cases there is a kind of approach which is a willingness to sacrifice the public interest to the private needs of a company, still behind the scenes, to whom this is going to be leased. On page 2 of the report we have this comment:

The figures show that without government assistance in any form the project would suffer losses for 2 or 3 years and would earn only small profits for several years thereafter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the significance of that? Simply that here is a



company which is going to lose money for 3 years, make small profits for a few more years and then presumably—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: Now, Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that it is all a question of credit. These people have to borrow the money. Are they going to borrow the great sums of money which are needed in a case like this, where there are no profits for 2 or 3 years, and profits which will be very small for a number of years? You cannot borrow \$100 million on that sort of statement. That is the problem, these people are borrowing money, the same as we are.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I must ask the hon. Prime Minister to allow me to make my comments on it, because, quite frankly, his comment is irrelevant. I am speaking of the fact that here we have an instance of what is today regarded as the "20th century version of risk capital." Here is a company which is going to suffer losses for 3 years, and then make small profits for another short number of years, and then, for a generation or two, it is going to be a very profitable venture.

Yet the people who are promoting this on a risk capital basis, so-called, say that the government has to come in and share in the proposition so that the possibility of losing even for the first 3 years will be removed.

If that is "risk capital," we have to re-define the whole term "risk," because even in the initial period when it is building up, the plea is made, and is accepted in the Glassco Report and implicitly by the Government at Ottawa and by this government as a sort of tenable principle, that we should "bail" these companies out so that the venture shall be profitable from the word "go."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point something out to the hon. member?

MR. MacDONALD: Let me continue. The hon. Prime Minister has had his say on the subject.

HON. MR. FROST: But it is a problem of credit.

MR. MacDONALD: I know it is.

HON. MR. FROST: Where do they get the money?

MR. MacDONALD: That is one of the problems for the investment fraternity.

HON. MR. PORTER: Where would the hon. member get the money now?

MR. MacDONALD: And the concept of that fraternity is that they have to have a profit from the very beginning, guaranteed from the public first.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the obtaining of money from any large financial institution, be it a bank, insurance company or an investment house, it is just about as simple as this: if the hon. member had \$1,000 to invest, would he invest it in a company whose financial future appeared to be uncertain? Certainly he would not, he would invest his money in a first mortgage, or something of that sort. Money comes from the accumulated savings of thousands of small investors. The money we borrow from the people of this province, through investment houses, for a great undertaking like hydro, represent the accumulation of the savings of thousands of people. That is where the money comes from.

MR. MacDONALD: May I inform the hon. Prime Minister that I am very well aware of that, but the point I am trying to make is, should these people be guaranteed the elimination of their losses for the first 3 years, without having, as part of the agreement, that in the latter part of it, when they are going to make great profits, some of those profits should come back to the Canadian people?

HON. MR. FROST: But they do, Mr. Speaker. We get corporation taxes and income taxes, and so forth.

MR. MacDONALD: Certainly we will get them, but we are going to get—

HON. MR. FROST: That is the way we make the “wheels go round”.

MR. MacDONALD: The simple proposition, which the hon. Prime Minister recognized, but is not prepared to concede for the purpose of debate, the simple proposition I am trying to make here is that there is no validity in the fact that you have not guaranteed any losses in the first 3 years.

HON. MR. FROST: We are not guaranteeing anything.

MR. MacDONALD: Certainly you are guaranteeing, that is why they have come in here.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. MacDONALD: This is why we are building the northern Ontario part of the line, so that these losses in the early years will be eliminated and it will be profitable from the very year they start.

Let me then go on to another point which I think is one which the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer have conceded many times in the course of their remarks, namely that this whole deal may “fold up”—it may collapse.

HON. MR. FROST: Of course it may.

MR. MacDONALD: We may have to work out some other kind of agreement.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, Mr. Speaker, of course we may.

MR. MacDONALD: And in that regard certainly the key sentence is the one which appeared on page 3 of the Glassco Report, where it says:

The ability of the company to adhere strictly to its time-table is a matter of considerable importance, because if it is not strictly adhered to, costs are going to rise.

Yet I invite hon. members to look at the time-table which is laid down here. There is not going to be one single aspect of it adhered to. That, Mr. Speaker, is an exceedingly significant aspect of the whole deal.

My third point is one which is really a documentation of the point which I have had some difficulty in getting the hon. Prime Minister to accept—whether he is really serious I am not certain—and that is, that the whole agreement is “loaded” in favour of the company, without having any sort of balance of protection for the public purse in the picture. For example, it states on page 3:

Interest is calculated at  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. and it is assumed that the excess of rentals received over interest and administered costs would be applied towards debt reduction

—in other words, anything over and above this fixed rental is going to reduce the debt of the company, and, in effect, is going to reduce the price eventually that company is going to have to pay.

For example, after 4 years there is going to be another charge come into the picture, or at least there is the suggestion of another charge:

In addition there is provision for an annual rental payable for the first time in the fourth year of operation equivalent to one per cent. of the cost of the northern Ontario section and payable by the company only to the extent that earnings are available.

In every instance the company's position is protected. Now listen to this significant paragraph on the same page:

There is no provision in the present proposal whereby the Crown corporation is guaranteed a rental

sufficient to meet its interest and administration costs and yield something over to permit amortization of the line.

In other words, if this whole thing were to collapse, the people who were running it could walk out, and the whole thing drop as a load on the Canadian public purse, with absolutely no guarantee.

HON. MR. FROST: And then Canada would have the whole pipe line.

HON. MR. PORTER: The entire pipe line would be built by then.

MR. MacDONALD: I beg your pardon?

HON. MR. PORTER: The whole pipe line would be built by then.

MR. MALONEY: We would have the whole pipe line. The hon. member is telling only half the story.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not telling only half the story, I am pointing out that every word in this agreement is "stacked" in favour of protecting the interests of Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited and, if I may be permitted to go on, I will show that this is true in one or two more cases, that is, not protecting the interests of the Canadian people who are going to underwrite this.

HON. MR. PORTER: Our arrangement is in the form of correspondence, it is not in this agreement.

MR. MacDONALD: I have read that correspondence.

HON. MR. FROST: We cannot lose.

MR. MacDONALD: In your letters and correspondence, you have accepted the agreement which the Federal Government has now made with Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited.

HON. MR. PORTER: No.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. MacDONALD: On what basis then have you accepted it? The hon. Prime Minister stated in his remarks that the agreement between Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited was made by the Federal Government and that, professedly with some reluctance, that this government had to "go along" and accept it. So if you agree to this in your letters to the Federal Government, you "go along" with it, you cannot argue yourselves out of that picture.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, our deal is just about as simple as this: With the Government of Canada, we enter into the building of this 600 miles of line at a cost of \$120 million, of which we put up \$35 million; we get our interest and principal back and, obviously, the agreement is "loaded" in favour of getting the company to buy us out as soon as possible.

MR. MacDONALD: Exactly.

HON. MR. FROST: As a matter of fact, if it is profitable—and I hope it is—we will get all our money back again in very short order, and then they will own it, and we will take the \$35 million and put it to another use.

MR. MacDONALD: Which brings me to another point that I think should be brought into the open, and a good look taken at it, and that is that any excess of revenue over rentals is immediately ploughed back to reduce the debt of the company.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, our debt.

MR. MacDONALD: And at any point afterwards, Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited can buy it out. In fact, after 1960 there is the incentive to buy it out, so that the net result is, taking for example a figure that Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited is going to pay it off in 1965, they will have paid it off with money they earned by that time, and they will have paid it off at the cost price of 1956.



In other words, Mr. Speaker, in 1965 we are going to hand over to this company, controlled by those American corporations, something that we built in 1956, which, by 1965 is going to have an infinitely greater value, and we are handing it over at the price of 1956. That is the kind of "bonanza" the government is handing over to "big business."

MR. MALONEY: There is nothing wrong with that.

MR. MacDONALD: Of course there is not, from the hon. member's point of view.

The Canadian people put up the money to build this. They risked their money and there is absolutely no risk in it for the company. Ten years from now—just a minute, let me finish—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: With all this "yacking," it is difficult to make a point. In 10 years from now, when the Canadian people put the money in, and when they built something which today will be valued at \$120 million, in 1965 it will have a value of considerably more than \$300 million, if you tried to buy it then. Yet the company is going to be able to get it for not \$120 million, but that amount subtracted from it the excess of the revenues over the rentals during that period; in other words, the Canadian people will give the taxes to them.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon. member know anything about taxes?

MR. MacDONALD: Surely I know about taxes.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Do not forget the 40 per cent. corporation tax. The hon. member should get down to elemental economics.

MR. MacDONALD: I have the elementals here. The Canadian people are paying for this and handing it over to the people who are across the line in the United States.

I now come to a point which I think is perhaps the most significant point in the proposition. The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer have conceded it. It is that after this case is referred to Clarkson-Gordon & Company, Mr. Glassco came up with confirmation of the fact that a publicly owned pipe line would be economically feasible even though no sale were made to the United States at all.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacDONALD: Just pause for a moment and consider the significance of this. For 3 years, in considering this project, this nation has been deluded by the "weepings and wailings" of the promoters of this company because they could not secure the finances to build it. I submit they cannot, for the simple reason they have established profit levels which are far beyond the requirements they might have, and the demands of the investment dealers. Surely it is implicit in the fact that at some later date, Mr. Glassco reminds us that if we do not sell a cubic foot of gas to the United States, it would be economically feasible to build this pipe line in Canada, made of Canadian goods, and developed in terms of Canadian interests, rather than in the interests of the United States. The other point I want to draw to your attention is this:

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. member that I think he should tell what Mr. Glassco's report said. Mr. Glassco tells us it is economically feasible, but he qualifies it, as you will notice, in his report, by saying that before that can be done, \$1 billion will have to be secured. It would cost about \$1 billion to bring the pipe line down, and make the necessary connections in Ontario to service the market which will be required to support it. Again, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that \$1 billion presents a problem. It would be economically feasible, of course.

His reference is to the suggestion made to build an all-Canadian line financed by the government, but it will be understood, Mr. Speaker, that to

build an all-Canadian line financed by the government would involve, of course, very heavy commitments on the part of government. His suggestion in his report is premised on that fact. If we get our "backs up against the wall," and we cannot do anything else, we can do that. You would have to bring the various governments into the picture to get them to do that, and of course that again would occasion time and delay and there is no unanimity of opinion on that when you get into government circles.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. Prime Minister is worried about time and delay, his worry is belated, because in the procedures we have followed, we have had far more time and delay on this issue than we would have had, if we had done it as a public issue at the outset.

HON. MR. NICKLE: May I ask a question?

MR. MacDONALD: May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No questions. The hon. member does not wish to answer, and a question cannot be asked.

HON. MR. NICKLE: If he cannot answer—

MR. MacDONALD: I am willing to answer, but I wish to get on with my points.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Is the hon. member in favour of this pipe line across northern Ontario?

MR. MacDONALD: I indicated at the outset, so that the hon. Minister's mind may be put at rest, that I was in favour of it, but when you say the only way to get the pipe line in northern Ontario is by this manner, I do not agree. In fact, I went through northern Ontario and discussed this matter before any of the hon. Ministers went through there.

HON. MR. KELLY: No, the hon. member did not, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. PORTER: It did not have much effect up there, did it?

MR. MacDONALD: Sometimes the fruits of labour come later than one expects in the first instance.

The point I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is this comment of Mr. Glassco's that a pipe line could have been built as an all-Canadian pipe line without selling a single cubic foot of gas to the United States. That idea is not a new one.

HON. MR. FROST: But if we are—

MR. MacDONALD: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: It is as simple as putting up \$1 billion.

MR. MacDONALD: I am glad the hon. Prime Minister has made this point of "\$1 billion". The cost is estimated at \$350 million, and that is all we are talking about, the main trunk line, not the ancillary system, or anything of that nature. It will cost \$350 million to be built by private enterprise, and it would cost less if we could take advantage of lower capitalization costs, and if this were done as a public enterprise.

The point I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is that what Mr. Glassco, very late in the day, now tells us about this point is something that was revealed in all of the early studies of the possibilities of building a pipe line in this country.

Back in 1951 and 1952, when an interest in pipe lines first developed, somebody—I do not know who exactly—was responsible for having a study made by Bechtel, an American concern, one of the most reputable pipe line consultants in the United States. There was a study made by experts at Stamford University, and both of these studies revealed that at that time, as Mr. Glassco now confirms, we could have built this pipe line in Canada as an economic proposition, without selling a single cubic foot of gas to the United States.

Therefore, in the light of that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this floundering which has gone on in the last two or three years, when it was built up and collapsed, built up again and collapsed again, was not necessary. If we wish to build this to meet the needs of the Canadian people, it can be done only if it is done as a public enterprise.

The final point with regard to this agreement which I wish to make, as the hon. Minister himself pointed out, is that the agreement is, in a sense, pretty much of an academic proposition which may have no relationship at all to the facts a few months from now, because as the hon. Prime Minister and as the hon. Minister have indicated a number of times, it is quite possible and quite probable that all this will collapse.

As a matter of fact, in this key paragraph in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's reply to Rt. hon. Mr. Howe in Ottawa, he says:

We have noted particularly that the proposed Crown corporation will not commence to build the northern Ontario section of the line and that the Government of Ontario will not be called upon to contribute any funds toward that project unless and until the Government of Canada has satisfied the Government of Ontario that Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited is in a position to carry out its commitment to build and put into operation all the other parts of the natural gas pipe line as contemplated by the agreement with that company referred to in your letter.

HON. MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member not agree with that?

MR. MacDONALD: I do, but I am saying that this agreement is one which 6 months from now may have no relevance to the picture at all.

HON. MR. PORTER: We have said that a number of times.

MR. MacDONALD: And it is going to collapse. Let me get to my point. It is going to collapse because we have refused to recognize what I am convinced is the sound economic basis upon which to build this line.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member would like to see this collapse. The hon. member would be very much disappointed if it did not collapse.

MR. MacDONALD: For the good of the consumers in the Province of Ontario and the lower gas rates they would get from a publicly-owned system, I agree with that. I hope it collapses.

HON. MR. PORTER: But the hon. member will vote for the Bill.

MR. MacDONALD: And if it collapses, we will get around to establishing something that will be for the good of the people of Canada and not for the good of a corporation in the United States.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yet the hon. member will vote for the Bill.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I will vote for the Bill when we get to the time of voting, if what has happened in the interval does not persuade me otherwise, and, if it is the only way we will get a pipe line into northern Ontario.

In doing so, I am recommending the fact that the requirements of the people of the Province of Ontario, because of the folly of the government in Ottawa, which this government is sharing, will have to be met. The people are going to have to pay for it "through the nose", but I am willing that the people of the Province of Ontario should "pay through the nose" and more expensively than necessary, so that northern Ontario can get this pipe line.

MR. CHILD: The hon. member is on both sides of the fence.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. member listened to the hon. Treasurer, he talked from both sides all through his speech.



Mr. Speaker, finally I want to turn for a moment to what the hon. Prime Minister touched upon and which, I think, is another aspect of this picture, which at the moment we perhaps are not going to have to cope with, but since this will be the one debate on this issue during this session, we should take a look at it. That is the distribution system.

Even the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer acknowledged that perhaps this whole arrangement will collapse, and we shall have to be forced by the situation to go over to public enterprise, it is my hope—

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): That is your hope.

MR. MacDONALD: It is my hope, because it will get gas to the people cheaper, even the people in Port Arthur. When all these other people have made their speeches, perhaps I can get back into the picture again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: If we have a distribution system, a publicly owned national pipe line—and I think we will have to because of the failures of the past—my belief is that a publicly-owned national pipe line must follow. Surely the lessons and experiences of the past are even more pertinent when we take a look at the distribution system. I was looking back through *Hansard* to see what the hon. Provincial Treasurer had to say about this.

HON. MR. PORTER: It will be consistent.

MR. MacDONALD: Very consistent, yes, in this instance. It is a rather amazing thing the extent to which the hon. Provincial Treasurer did go, in regard to the distribution system. He made this statement:

There is no justification in the public interest for getting into that sort of "half baked" type of business.

This is his description of what is the case in much of our economy; namely,

a mixture of private and public enterprise, but it was to him a "half baked" type of business:

If the Federal Government decides that the main Trans-Canada Pipe Line is to be a publicly owned pipe line, built and administered by some organization of the Federal Government, our position in dealing with the matter might be altered.

I want respectfully to suggest that this government give serious consideration to altering it for two reasons:

I wonder if this House is aware of the extent to which the distribution system in the Province of Ontario, as well as the national trunk line, is falling into the hands of almost complete American interests?

In the Province of Ontario today we have throughout the northern part of the province, of which the hon. member for Port Arthur will be very much aware, the Northern Ontario Natural Gas Company. I do not know whether the Lakehead has come to agreement with them or not, but this government has today sold the franchise in a majority of the communities stretching from Kenora to Barrie, most of the franchises in that area, representing a major portion of this province, to a company called the Northern Ontario Natural Gas Company.

But what is this company? The president of it is what you find in all these companies, one Canadian, who is a "front man", R. K. Farris of Vancouver, a west coast Canadian oil man who has interests in natural gas developments in the northwestern part of the United States.

The vice-president is Chester Grey, an American, who came into this country. It was he who was sent into northern Ontario to survey and organize the area.

Also on the board of directors is C. Spencer Clark of Seattle, Washington, who is chairman of the board of Cascade Natural Gas Corporation, Washington, a company with wide utility experience in Washington, Oregon and Idaho. Another is Leslie T. Fournier, who is treasurer of Panhandle Eastern

Pipe Lines Company, one of the largest gas distribution companies in the United States, and who is a native of Sturgeon Falls, Ontario.

Also, there is Blancke Noyes, of a large United States investment banking firm. And finally, another director is Leonard Dixon, a partner of Bear, Stearns and Company, another United States investment banking firm.

I respectfully suggest to this House that this company, with one Canadian as a "front man," is about as much a part of northern Ontario as Wall Street. I draw to the attention of the House that today this company, putting in a distribution system in the Province of Ontario, has already used up a majority of the franchises between Kenora and the City of Barrie—

HON. MR. PORTER: What does the hon. member mean by "using them up"?

MR. MacDONALD: Signing agreements with the municipalities. I am fully aware of the battles which went on in each of these municipalities, which ended in this company getting the contracts, and each of these battles is an interesting story in itself. But here is the situation, that not only is the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited completely dominated by American interests, but the major portion of the distribution system today is under the control of American interests.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is by no means "a majority."

MR. MacDONALD: It is rather a healthy "chunk" of the Province of Ontario, when all of the communities between Kenora and Barrie are included. I do not know how else it could be described. Geographically, it is a very major portion of Ontario.

MR. CHILD: What population do they have?

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. member persists in that question, he will have a number of his northern Ontario friends on his back.

Apart from the control which has resulted in our distribution system, is this fact: if we build a distribution system on a profit-making basis, what inevitably will happen is that the distribution system will be built, in the first instance, where it is most profitable, where they have the greatest population and industrial concentration, and the profits from that area will be pocketed by the people who happened to build it.

They will not be able to extend the distribution system into the far-flung parts of the province, where, at the moment, it might not be an economically-feasible proposition to build the distribution system. But once you get natural gas there, we would be in a better position to realize some of the things spoken of for years by our friends in northern Ontario, including the added incentive of being enabled to develop secondary industries, which would atone for the autonomy each of them now enjoy.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: May I ask the hon. member a question:

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: What can this House do about that particular system? What has this House to do with it?

HON. MR. PORTER: It has nothing to do with this Bill at all.

MR. MacDONALD: I know it has not, but the hon. Prime Minister arose and discussed the distribution system, and I consider it is relevant.

To answer the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Mapledoram), let me say if this government had done what it proposed to do originally, and if we can take as authoritative the *Globe and Mail*, which seems to have a pipe line as to what happens in the inner sanctums of the government, there was a report a year ago last Christmas that the government was considering building the distribution system along the same lines as hydro, and if that were done, today we would have a co-operative system, in which the people of Ontario would all co-operate.

MR. WARDROPE: Whether they were using it or not.

MR. MacDONALD: There would have been areas which were most heavily industrialized, which would have had new sources of facilities opened to them, and would have provided for the development of secondary industries in the northern part of the province.

MR. WARDROPE: They would have to pay for it whether they wanted it or not, under the system referred to by the hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know the significance of the remark. Perhaps I am becoming a little obtuse, but I do not grasp it, and I cannot see the significance of the comment.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think the lessons which have emerged, in stringing a line across this nation, will be driving this government to give careful consideration to private enterprise as the answer, and the government may be forced to resort to this, which I think is implicit for building a distribution system within the Province of Ontario.

Now, before we do get around to building the distribution system, except insofar as it is represented by the Consumers' Gas in this area, I say to the hon. members it is not too late to bring in legislation—if I may reply directly to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—as we are going to establish a water commission, and as we have established hydro, and provide some sort of an arrangement which would make certain that natural gas would be distributed all across this province, equitably to everybody.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I submit this government cannot do that. The choice is with the municipalities. If they want to go into private enterprise, they still have the right to do so. What is wrong with that?

MR. MacDONALD: The choice is with the municipalities in the same way that they have built local hydros—

MR. LYONS: I think the hon. member wants to run this like they ran the coal business in England.

MR. MacDONALD: If private enterprise develops this, the capital costs will be higher; their profit level will be inordinately high in many instances, and taxes will have to be paid, and that will result in a high price for natural gas in this area, and the little companies will go broke, and fall back on to the municipalities, and when they do, it is conceivable that in 10, 15, 20, or 25 years, this government will be forced to step in—

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: The hon. member admits this government will be here 25 years from now. Do not worry about that.

MR. MacDONALD: Touche. I should have said, "The government of the day" will be forced to step in, and take over these little systems, as they were forced to do in connection with the bankrupt railways in order to build the Canadian Pacific Railway system, and surely that prospect is very real, when we consider today the economy of developing a system for the distribution of natural gas, and I think we should act, before we run into that kind of a "schemozzle"—

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would rather have the companies go bankrupt than the municipalities.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I was going to finish, but they have started me all over again.

MR. MALONEY: Is it true that the hon. member was really vaccinated with a Victorola needle?

MR. MacDONALD: There are, I think, instances where these companies have gone broke in connection with local utilities, and the municipalities have had to take them over. This is comparable to the situation where a group of private promoters were connected with the Abitibi Canyon, and they



went broke 3 times and the government had to take them over, and one of the interesting things they discovered after they took them over was that there were included several leading "Tories", even including the hon. Prime Minister of the day.

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to start the hon. member all over again, but I have listened to his remarks very carefully. On the premise that Ottawa did enter into an agreement with the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company, and the proposal which was put to this government, would the hon. member suggest that this government should have said: "No, we cannot 'go along' with that; we are going to do it our way—or else no way"?

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. leader of the Opposition has a pipe line to the government in Ottawa—

MR. YAREMKO: I asked a question of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I am answering it.

MR. YAREMKO: No, he is not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: If the hon. leader of the Opposition has a pipe line to Ottawa, and has learned something to the effect that the Ottawa government would build it without this government coming in, my answer would be "Yes". I think if this government had bargained a little harder, they would have forced the government at Ottawa to build the pipe line, after the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company "welshed" on its deal.

And they should have said, what I think will have to be said, eventually, that the ideal solution of this would be that the Trans-Canada pipe line would be built by public enterprise, by the Federal Government, and then it should be left to the provincial governments to try and build the distribution systems.

MR. YAREMKO: My question was, should we have adopted the "or else" policy?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

MR. A. REAUME (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I want to commence my remarks by saying that I think, from an over-all point of view, this is a good Bill. I think the province and the Federal Government have, in fact, made a deal which will help the people of the province, and also the country. We have studied the Bill, and have gone into all the "ifs" and "ands" and our Party feels it is a good Bill.

I want to add to that that I am certain the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. members of this House—and I might also mention Rt. hon. Mr. Howe, hon. Mr. Martin, and hon. Mr. Pearson—are all honourable gentlemen, and at every opportunity will further the interests of this country as a whole. There is nobody in either House, the provincial House or the federal House in Ottawa, of whom I know, who is interested in "selling Canada short", but we are not in favour of these so-called "isms". We have studied the Bill, but we left out the "isms".

To those people who apparently want to be friendly to our neighbours to the south, but who think it is alright to pat them on the back with one hand and hit them in the face with the other, I want to say that I think their policy is wrong.

The United States of America—one of the greatest countries in the world—has, down through the years, been very friendly to the Empire and the Commonwealth of which we in Canada are proudly part and parcel. In World War I and World War II, the boys of Canada and the United States marched down the same road; there were many, many gallons of blood spilled in order that we—all of us—might be free people, and it is true that from time to time, the people in Canada—and not only the government, but in smaller sections of the country, have, in many instances,

borrowed money from firms in the United States.

That money, as I think was properly explained, comes largely from mortgage companies and insurance companies which represent, in fact, the policy holders of the companies.

One of the things I was glad to hear was that it was to be a transcontinental line. Of course, nobody wants another war, but in times of peace this pipe line, running across several of the provinces of Canada could be and will be, beyond any doubt whatever, an all-Canadian pipe line, built for the people of Canada. Those who have their offices in Washington, or in other places in the United States, will not have anything to do with the control of the gas provided to any locality in Canada. We have agencies of the Crown of our own who will control the price of gas, and make certain that the people of the various provinces are not penalized as to price.

I had no way of finding out, so I do not know whether the hon. member

for York South is in favour of the Bill or opposed to it. In one breath, he is for it, while the next moment he pulls it all apart.

MR. CHILD: I think the hon. member is talking with the next election in view.

Mr. Reaume moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House may I inform hon. members that tomorrow we shall proceed with the debate on second reading of Bill No. 91, and with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 of the clock p.m.







# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| First report Standing Committee on Mining, Mr. Spooner .....   | 415 |
| Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada<br>Pipe Line, Bill to facilitate, Mr. Porter, second reading (continued) ..... | 416 |
| Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Gordon   | 431 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Dymond, agreed to .....  | 444 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 444 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Spooner from the Standing Committee on Mining presents the committee's first report as follows and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Your committee recommends that the following Bill be not reported:

Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Beach Protection Act.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he does not think the attitude of the Committee on Mining is a little remarkable in one sense, in turning down the government Bill, "An Act to amend The Beach Protection Act," which was introduced here by an hon. Cabinet Minister and "killed" in committee in his absence, and in regard to which the final decree has been read this afternoon with the hon. Minister still absent.

I would think that a rather unusual procedure, to say the least, and I cannot recall at the moment any similar happening.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the matter to which The Beach Protection Act relates is one which was introduced here for the purpose and with the avowed intention of submitting it to the Committee on Mining for its judgment. We welcome the opinion of the Committee on Mining. It is obviously a matter of some doubt. The problem of beach protection is one which has been discussed in this Legislature, as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, for a very long time.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied with the report of the Committee on Mining. I do not think there will be any possibility of proceeding with the Bill again this year. It might be possible to have some amendments introduced at another time. I myself am satisfied with the decision of the Committee on Mining on this Bill.

On the other hand, it is perhaps just as well to let the hon. members study this matter further, and if they feel the Bill should be reported, then it can be.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I imagine the hon. Prime Minister is aware that those who sponsored this idea and who had conferences with the hon. Minister of Mines in relation thereto, asked that legislation be passed, affecting a certain portion of the shoreline of Lake Erie. The hon. Minister, in his judgment, made it a wide-open Bill applicable to all beaches and all river banks in the province.

It seems to me that, when the government took the responsibility of introducing this Bill and making it applicable throughout the province, they should



not have allowed it to die so uncere-  
moniously in the absence of the hon.  
Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker,  
I assume it would have to be re-  
introduced in a different form. I am  
prepared to look at it.

One of the hon. members present  
said the persons concerned were coming  
back to the Committee on Conservation  
and to the hon. Ministers concerned,  
with a request dealing with a smaller  
area than that dealt with in this Bill.

MR. OLIVER: Very well.

MR. MacDONALD: It is a bizarre  
arrangement, but we had better "kill"  
it before we get a bizarre result.

HON. MR. FROST: Was the hon.  
member there to help "kill" it?

MR. MacDONALD: I was there.

Report adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Before the Orders of the day, I  
would like to welcome to the Assembly  
this afternoon, the students from St.  
Peter's High School, Peterborough;  
Oakridge Public School, Toronto;  
Cloverdale Public School, Toronto;  
Pauline Johnson Collegiate Institute,  
Brantford; Campbellford High School;  
and the Delta Collegiate Institute,  
Hamilton.

I also wish to welcome the large  
group of ladies from Pefferlaw.

Orders of the day.

## THE NORTHERN ONTARIO PIPE LINE ACT (Continued)

MR. A. REAUME (Essex North):  
Mr. Speaker, with reference to this Bill,  
the argument in this House has been,  
in the main, as to whether or not we  
favour a pipe line being built out of  
public funds, or being built by private

enterprise. I think it is possible that  
some hon. members of the House could  
be properly in favour of building it out  
of public funds, without casting slurs  
upon other people from other parts  
of the country or from other places.  
I do not think we should refer in any  
form to "red-blooded, free enterprising  
Canadians who have, in a sense, lost  
all faith in the province or the country."

Some hon. members may smile, but  
one of our jobs is to pay tribute to  
those people who in the past have been  
"red-blooded" and who are interested  
in the building-up of the province and  
the country. Those who have gone  
before us, and many who are still here,  
are concerned about the future of the  
country. It is indeed refreshing to see  
a government of this province, and the  
government in Ottawa, working as a  
team in the interests of the people as  
a whole.

Mr. Speaker, anything the hon. mem-  
bers can do in the interest of the prov-  
ince should be done, without casting any  
slurs upon anybody.

When we speak of money coming  
here from foreign countries, and parti-  
cularly from the United States, it is  
well that we bear in mind that into  
almost every city in the province—yes,  
and in many smaller communities too—  
American capital has found its way.  
The truth is, if it had not been for  
money coming in from the people out-  
side Ontario, it may be that the flourish-  
ing industries we now have in the prov-  
ince would not have gone as far as  
they have.

We should not view the American  
capitalists as great, big, bald-headed  
men, with "pot" stomachs, who do  
nothing but spend their time worrying  
about how they can invest their money  
in Canada, in order to try and "gouge"  
our people.

True, they invest their money in the  
province with the intention of making  
a profit, but it is not only foreign capital  
which is invested into the province.  
With the foreign capital, and with that  
of our own people, and that of the  
people who have come here from many

parts of the world, it has been possible for us to mould Canada into the great country it is today.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member has missed the point.

MR. REAUME: The very same speech which we heard the hon. member from York South make yesterday afternoon will be found almost word for word, in the speech made by Mr. Salsberg in February, 1954, if the hon. members care to go back to the record.

MR. A. GROSSMAN: He makes that same speech every day in the year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. REAUME: Mr. Speaker, you can take it from me that the hon. member for York South is 24 months behind "Joe".

If you want to read the speech, I have it here, and the essence of the hon. member's speech is exactly the same, for the same purpose and with the same intent. If we are going to discuss in the House the merits of public ownership versus free private enterprise, that is one thing. But we must bear in mind that I do not think any of the hon. members of this House are concerned with giving away the rights of the people.

The hon. member should bear in mind that, in the interest of controlling the gas, or the price of gas in the province, we have in Ontario a controller whom I think is doing a very excellent job. This man, who is a responsible employee of the government of the province, is going to make certain that the people, who want to take from our people things which are not right and proper, will not be able to do so. I hope he will be there always for the purpose of safeguarding the people against that very thing.

I remember an instance which might be of some interest to the hon. member, back in 1948, which happened in the southwestern part of the province. There was a real shortage of gas and in the city from which I come, there were 30,000 people who, at that time, were out of work. The reason for them being out of work was not because there was

no work these people could do, but the real reason was that the great Ford and Chrysler plants, and many other plants, did not have gas in order to operate their plants.

At that time—in 1948—the hon. Minister of Mines, who now happens to be the hon. Prime Minister of the province, called all the parties concerned to his office and a feasible and sane deal was worked out. Mr. Speaker, that deal was simply this: by the working out of a plan whereby we combined public funds with private funds, we were able in the City of Windsor to build a storage plant. During the building of the storage plant, these 30,000 people were put back into their old jobs in the plants.

There was also a deal worked out whereby the City of Windsor—and other places as well—were to purchase some gas from our friends on the opposite side of the border. The Panhandle people had a pipe line which covered the states of Ohio and Indiana and on into the City of Detroit. At the off peak load—which means that the time when the people of these states did not require a supply of gas coming from the other parts of the United States—we in Windsor, and in other parts of the province, were able to purchase gas at a reasonable and fair price.

I suspect, if any of our gas is going to be piped into the United States, it is not going to be the Federal Power Commission of the United States who is going to set the price of the gas. I think it is going to be our people over here. Whether or not it be in a time of war or in a time of peace, it would appear that these two great countries, which have always worked as a team, are going to continue so to do.

There is no use making foolish statements about places in other parts of the province, which are going to secure a supply of gas from the pipe line; that they will have a monopoly on everything; and that they are going to go in there "holus-bolus" and obtain franchises. What does the hon. member think?

What does any hon. member think is the purpose of having a fuel controller in this province? I understand that before any franchise is given at all to any place or to any group of people, it must first be approved by The Department of Mines, and by the person in charge of controlling the fuel rates.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have to spend so much of our time worrying about that part of it at all. There has been some mention made that the Americans—these “bad people” again—are going into the open market and purchase all the stock they can. I understand today the stock is to be placed on the markets of Canada, and that anybody can purchase the stock. If it happens that a portion of the stock—any portion of it—finds its way into the hands of the people of the United States, it will make no difference at all. We find that is true in the case of industries all over the place, and, Mr. Speaker, we have plenty of them. We must bear in mind that when hydro was born, it was a private company. The money which first started hydro consisted of private funds. As the years passed, it finally came into the hands of the province, and proved to be a very excellent thing. It might so happen that as the years pass the pipe line, about which we are now speaking, may some day find its way into the hands of public ownership. I do not know. That is something I should think which the people, who are here at that time, will have to handle if it then appears that is the proper step to take.

I want to say again, I think it creates a false impression, and one which we would not want to have spread outside the House, when we slur people who have thought enough of Canada to come here and invest millions upon millions of dollars of their own for the purpose of building up this country. Rather than sit here and throw slurs and insults at those people, we should be encouraging the American people, and other people as well, and let them know if they want to join with us in the building of a great nation, it will be perfectly fine. We should invite them to come here.

Coming from a border town where we have the opportunity every day of dealing with people from the United States, may I say we should be thankful they do not feel about us the way certain people have spoken of them. They look upon us as being fair-minded people. They do not want to be faced all the time with this business of investing their money over here, and have somebody getting up and wanting to socialize this and socialize that. That experiment was made in one of the provinces in the west. They went so far as to socialize factories making shoes, a Crown company properly organized and socialized, if my information is right—

MR. MacDONALD: It is not.

MR. REAUME: If my information is correct, it went broke, and if my information is also right—

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member's information is years out of date.

MR. REAUME: —with claims of socializing everything they can “grab hold of,” they have actually driven out of the province people who wanted to do, in that province, what we are trying to do here, to build it up.

MR. MacDONALD: Is this a bid to join the Tory Party?

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member (Mr. MacDonald) will be there first.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. REAUME: I just want to say in answer to that, if I had to make a choice—but, fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to have to make a choice—but if I were asked to make a choice—

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): The hon. member (Mr. Reaume) tried in 1943.

MR. REAUME: If I had to choose whether I would follow such people as the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe and the hon. Prime Minister of this province, or the hon. member for York South, I would exclude the hon. member for York South right “off the bat.”



Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one thing more. The hon. member said at the opening of his speech, "I am going to vote for the Bill."

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

MR. REAUME: "But I do not want to."

MR. MacDONALD: Under certain conditions.

MR. REAUME: First of all he wanted to; then he did not want to. Then he goes on for an hour and a half and tries to tear the Bill apart. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that after every hon. member of this House has had an opportunity of speaking, inasmuch as this is an all-important Bill, a Bill of great importance to every Canadian, I think, at the appropriate time, we should call upon the hon. members in the House to stand and record their vote as to whether they are for or against the Bill.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, being a representative from that great unparalleled part of northwestern Ontario known as "Port Arthur-East Thunder Bay", I cannot help but rise and add my support to this Bill which, I believe, will provide for one of the most important projects in this great Dominion, second only to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway over Canadian soil from coast to coast, rather than have it go down into the United States, as some would have liked to have seen it in those days.

I thank the hon. Provincial Treasurer for bringing this Bill before us. I wish to thank the hon. Prime Minister, the Cabinet, and this government, for making it possible financially to build this line. This is one time when I wish to thank, and to be in accord with the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. members of his Party, in their support of this great Bill. I congratulate the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) on a very fine speech. I agree with every word he said.

I was amazed the other day to hear an hon. member of this House say that this gas pipe line running through northwestern Ontario would have to be put through almost solid rock, because from Kenora east that was the character of the terrain there. May I say to the hon. member that we have  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million acres of the finest arable land in the Province of Ontario. How could we grow these tremendous timber resources if we had not?

The site of the proposed gas pipe line through northwestern Ontario has been surveyed both by helicopter and ground service, and I would like to tell the hon. members of this House, that it is not an expensive piece of construction and will not be going through rock formation except, perhaps, in a very small portion of it.

I am rather amazed too, to hear these constant remarks about the great unproductive area it goes through in northwestern Ontario, that it will not produce wealth for years to come, and that this \$120 million is money which this Dominion and this province is jeopardizing.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me I should read a little from our submission to the Gordon Royal Commission on Economic Prospects. We are speaking here about power. Mark you, that is the one drawback in our whole economy in northwestern Ontario now. We are developing so quickly that we are fast using up every last bit of hydro power we have, and we need more energy to run our industries.

At the close of 1955, the northwestern region of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission had a peak capacity of 318,000 kilowatts in their power development, 56,000 kilowatts slated for use in 1956, and undeveloped resources estimated at nearly 200,000 kilowatts.

This is interesting, and it is said "this is the unproductive part of Ontario." In the brief to the Royal Commission we said:

Since the end of the World War, the northwest peak demand increased 119 per cent. compared to 102 per cent. for southern Ontario, indicating

the great and widespread development of the region. Full development of the waterpower resources of the north-west will provide more than 516,000 kilowatts, or the equivalent of 750,000 horsepower electric energy which will be needed and more. The demand is growing and will continue to grow from our mining industries and expanding communities.

The ultimate utilization—and this is important—of waterpower in northwestern Ontario is in sight. We simply have to have gas. Other sources of power, such as thermo plants, coal, oil or nuclear energy, and inter-connections with other systems, are receiving concentrated study by Hydro to keep ahead of this insatiable demand, but gas is the most important thing in our present picture.

The presidents of many of our paper companies in their speeches the other day told you, as hon members will note if they read them, that our pulp and paper industry would double its capacity in the next 20 years. Where will the energy come from, Mr. Speaker, for that tremendous expansion programme unless it is from gas? Still the Press this week, Mr. Speaker, published the news that the United States steel industry plans a 3-year, \$3 billion expansion of the industry. It will boost the industry's output 15 million tons to a total of 143 million tons by 1959.

For the past 10 years American steel companies have been expanding at the rate of about 3.5 million tons per year and have spent \$7 billion in new plants and modernization.

"And there will be 'more to come' to meet the needs of the 'rapidly growing population of our country'," announced Benjamin Fairless, president of the Iron and Steel Institute of the United States.

The United States steel industry must look to new sources for raw material. The need will be satisfied in part, though at high cost, by beneficiation of the low-grade Michigan and Minnesota ores. But to a large degree the

United States will rely on imported ores—especially from Canada.

Steel demand in the United States amounts to three quarters of a ton per person per year. The people use more steel than any other substance except coal and water. Canadian consumption of steel is somewhat less but it is high, and it is increasing more rapidly than in any other nation, a leading Canadian authority points out.

While Canada exported to the United States increasing millions of tons of raw ore, she imported from that country in a single year manufactured iron and steel products worth \$1.5 billion.

If our country—and I am speaking now especially of northwestern Ontario—is to increase the rate of its industrialization, to close the gap in manufacturing, is the time not opportune for large-scale expansion of Canada's steel industry?

As elsewhere, the steel shortage in the Lakehead district is acute. Orders are from 6 to 9 months behind. Construction projects are held up indefinitely for lack of steel. Unemployment is the direct result.

Northwestern Ontario is the "hub" of a great and growing iron ore production region. I do not have to tell the hon. members that in a few years it will be the mid-continental port for ocean tonnage. It will be served by the Trans-Canada Natural Gas Pipe Line. Does this area possess definite advantages for the location of a steel processing industry? To find the answer to that question by direct communication with steel firms on this continent and overseas, a "Lakehead Steel Committee" has been organized, representative of interested organizations in Fort William and Port Arthur. These include the chambers of commerce, city councils, Trades and Labour Council, and the Northwestern Ontario Development Association.

In connection with the development in northwestern Ontario—and I am sure the hon. member for Rainy River will bear me out in this—there is industry such as Steep Rock.

Just as raw timber, once exported to the United States, now forms the economic backbone of the district in the production of newsprint, pulp, fine papers, corrugating liner and other forest products. The opinion in northwestern Ontario is that our iron ore can be made the basis for a steel industry to meet the insatiable demands of both United States and Canada.

In short, the committee plans a comprehensive study of what it believes is a great opportunity and an imperative need.

The natural gas pipe line passing through great northwestern Ontario will make available cheap, clean fuel, which will open up new possibilities for industry, and the greatest of these will be smelters and steel mills.

I was amazed at some of the remarks which have been made in this House. The hon. member for York South yesterday made a statement, which I have not forgotten, and of which I am going to see that all the people in northwestern Ontario become aware. Quoting from yesterday's *Hansard*, we read the following:

MR. MacDONALD: And it is going to collapse. Let me get to my point. It is going to collapse because we have refused to recognize what I am convinced is the sound economic basis upon which to build this line.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member would like to see this collapse. The hon. member would be very much disappointed if it did not collapse.

MR. MacDONALD: For the good of the consumers in the Province of Ontario and the lower gas rates they would get from a publicly-owned system, I agree with that, I hope it collapses.

At that time I think he was talking about our municipalities entering into contracts with private enterprise.

MR. MacDONALD: Sure, it has collapsed 3 times already.

MR. WARDROPE: My people want this power, and if they can secure it within the next 2 years, it will be of inestimable value to them. And yet the hon. member for York South says he "hopes it will collapse," and if it does, it will bring about a delay of perhaps 10 or 20 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to see our gas used in Canada. We will need it, and if there is any breakdown in the Trans-Canada pipe line negotiations—and I sincerely hope there is not, because it will only cause further delay if there is—I think we should go ahead on our own, and see that all of this great gas supply, and the power from it, will be used to build up our country—Canada.

MR. W. G. NODEN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have but little to add to what has been said this afternoon by the hon. member for Port Arthur.

I was very interested in the detailed report by the hon. Treasurer. In supporting Bill 91—all-Canadian pipe line—this government is giving recognition for the use of another natural product of Canada, gas which means competitive power for the people of this great province.

The hon. Prime Minister and his government are looking to the future welfare of the people and their needs. Sure, there are attending problems, but these will be solved in due course. The mining and pulpwood communities of northern Ontario were not built up in a few short years, but came about by people giving of themselves, and trying to better their position, at the same time knowing the investment would pay off healthy dividends.

Ontario will continue to grow with a government as of today, always looking to the future. That is good sound government for the people of this province. Let all people invest their money irrespective of from where it comes.



MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to prolong this debate. I think we have had enough "gas" for today, and I am a little skeptical about the line being located in northern Ontario; perhaps we should reconsider the location.

Yesterday afternoon, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer was speaking on the Bill concerning the pipe line, he seemed to be very, very cautious, and continually referred to an agreement with the Federal Government regarding the pipe line in terms such as, "Well, it is no concern of ours; it is entirely for the Federal Government."

HON. MR. PORTER: I did not say it was no concern of ours.

MR. THOMAS: Oh yes, the hon. Provincial Treasurer did. It will be found in the record.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not think the record will show any such statement.

HON. MR. FROST: The recollection of the hon. member is faulty, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. PORTER: I said there is a constitutional responsibility connected with it.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): If I may be allowed to finish, Mr. Speaker, I think we should take a much more aggressive attitude. We are not the junior partner in this project, when we are asked to contribute a maximum of \$35 million toward a project which is expected to cost in the neighbourhood of \$117 million. I think if we realize the people of Ontario provide 50 per cent. of the revenue to the Federal Government and that the contribution by the people of Ontario, directly and indirectly, amounts to about \$75 million, hon. members will recognize that this is

of great interest to the people of this province.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we are not the junior partner in this. If we consider the amount which will be contributed, directly and indirectly, by the people of the Province of Ontario, we are, I think all hon. members will admit, the senior partner.

I do not think the hon. Prime Minister is too happy about this arrangement. He stated yesterday we should examine this question very thoroughly. We support the idea of a public undertaking, because of the good job which has been done by the Ontario Hydro. We think if it was a Crown undertaking, the development of northern Ontario would be much more rapid than it will be under free enterprise, and to support my contention, Mr. Speaker, may I say that if we consider the tremendous job which has been done in rural Ontario, in respect to electrification in recent years, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he would not agree with me that some of these farms would not have power today if it had been left to free enterprise? We have to attribute those things to public undertakings, such as the Ontario Hydro.

We of the CCF Party are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this construction of an all-Canadian line should be undertaken by a Crown corporation. That is our belief. That is one alternative.

Mr. Speaker, may I, in order to remove any anxiety which may be felt by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, tell him we intend to support this Bill, with these reservations.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is the way to talk.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I, too, hesitate to prolong this debate, but inasmuch as I am sitting very close to the hon. member for York South, and inasmuch as the remarks he made yesterday are exactly contrary to the views held by this Party—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: He is simply a young "Lochinvar" who came out of the west, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHICHER: —I believe I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say something about Bill 91.

In developing the point I wish to make, inasmuch as the hon. member for York South, sitting on my left, is a great one to quote from papers and articles which have been written in the months which are past, I would like to remind him of some of the things he said yesterday, and while it is true I have no newspaper articles or editorials to support my claim, I am sure it will be supported by the memories of the hon. members of this House.

The hon. member for York South endeavoured to make the point that this Bill was really no good, and that this undertaking should be carried out by the people of Canada, and not allow American interests to come into Ontario at all, and he quoted from a book concerning the days away back to the time of Sir John A. Macdonald, trying to show that this country, to a large extent, had been developed by Socialism, and, in referring to the "hairy-chested, red-blooded capitalists in this country of ours"—he said there were just no such people at all.

May I suggest to the hon. member for York South, Mr. Speaker—and with all due respect to him and his Party—that this great country, now the leader of all small nations, has done very well since 1867, without his Party whatsoever. I further suggest to him most humbly, and with no desire to hurt his feelings, that this country will be able to get along for the next 100 years without his Party.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No doubt about that.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, a partnership between the Liberals and the Conservatives. Now it comes out.

MR. WHICHER: There is no partnership between myself and any of the Conservative Party at all—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: Would the hon. member like to go to Bruce County and see the so-called "partnership" between the Conservative Party and the CCF?

MR. MacDONALD: We had a candidate there.

MR. WHICHER: I will say you did, on the last day. And, Mr. Speaker, speaking of campaign expenses, that candidate did not have to pay any at all.

MR. MacDONALD: It was the local movement that paid them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: There was no local movement up there.

MR. OLIVER: It was much more than local.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that yesterday the hon. member for York South was not only trying to hit at Bill 91, but was trying to hit at all of the capitalistic and free-enterprise systems throughout this whole Dominion of Canada.

No doubt the hon. member for York South is a great reader, and he should know there are many, many Canadians in all branches of life, in the professions, in industry, and also great capitalists, of whom I think we in this country should be very, very proud.

May I mention one? In the year 1861—or perhaps it was 1869—a small store was opened here in Toronto. It was a very, very small store, and there was only one man connected with it. He immediately began to make a success of it, and went out to the fall fairs and gave pamphlets away. Today, there are millions of these pamphlets going out all over the Dominion of Canada, from the Northwest Territories to Newfoundland.

That man's name was Timothy Eaton. He was not an American; he was a great Canadian, and has helped develop

the Province of Ontario and, in fact, the entire Dominion. And there are others like him who have also been very successful.

MR. MacDONALD: Did he receive a subsidy from the government to help him become established?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: I would like to remind the hon. member for York South of a little blacksmith's shop which was opened back about 1903, in the Town of Newcastle, and which has expanded to a very great extent.

The owner of that little shop was named "Massey" and from that little blacksmith's shop has come the great Massey-Ferguson Corporation—as it is now called—which I am sure all hon. members will agree is not doing too badly when we consider it was started by a Canadian, who began by making plowshares on a small scale.

There are dozens and dozens of examples which could be cited, of men who should be commended, and not cut down by such remarks as those to which we listened yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member where he thinks the Americans received their money when they started? It is a way of life; the fathers helping the sons. Before the English people came here the population of the United States was comprised largely of Indians. When the English did arrive, England helped them out financially, and there would still be billions of pounds of English capital in the United States, had it not been for two great wars, which compelled them to take most of their capital out of the United States and back into their own country.

It is only natural that American capital should come into this country to help us out in the years to come, and American money has come into all the provinces of Canada, from Newfoundland, through Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and right through to the western part

of Canada. I am sure that our little country, if it continues to expand as it has, will, within a comparatively short time, be assisting other countries throughout the world who are not as fortunate as we.

I am not sure these figures are correct, but I think the hon. member for York South said that 20 per cent. of the capital structure in this country is now being operated with American money. May I ask the hon. member, what difference does that make anyway? Would the hon. member suggest he would not just as soon have an American dollar bill as a Canadian dollar bill?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member is missing the point.

MR. WHICHER: The hon. member for York South did not have a point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: I will get to the point quickly enough. To develop this further, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly think it is a great thing to have this American capital coming into this country.

MR. MacDONALD: And controlling the policies, too?

MR. WHICHER: They do not control the policies. That statement is simply more of the nonsense the hon. member said yesterday about a "pipe line into Ottawa" or about some important capitalist telling the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe to "go plump".

MR. MacDONALD: He did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: I am sure the hon. members of this House will agree—except perhaps the little group to my left—that there is not a single man in the world who can tell the Rt. hon. C. D. Howe to "go plump" and get away with it.

MR. MacDONALD: He did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.



MR. WHICHER: Just let somebody try it, and see what happens. These gentlemen are experienced in public affairs; they are not like the hon. member for York South and myself, who have only been here for a couple of weeks, and then come in and try to tell the whole country how it should be run.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Just a young Lochinvar out of the west.

MR. MacDONALD: Are you now Conservative?

MR. WHICHER: I am no more a Conservative than the hon. member for York South, but I did not come into this House with the idea of telling the people, or the hon. members on this or the other side of the House—some of whom have been here for nearly 40 years—that the whole policy of Ontario and Canada is wrong, and that they must “do it my way”—

MR. MacDONALD: If half the people of Ontario feel the policy is wrong, why not give voice to their views?

MR. WHICHER: I will criticize them constructively at every possible point, but not with the idea of getting headlines and talking a lot of nonsense. We will have many of the hon. member's people with us before we are through.

Even when this American money comes in, the hon. member says it is controlled entirely by American interests, and quotes figure after figure to show it is controlled.

Personally, I cannot see the difference, in the first place. Roughly speaking, about 50 per cent. of their profits go to Ontario and to the Federal Government in the form of taxes, so they do not control that portion. In this particular Bill, “51 per cent. of the stock” is mentioned, which I agree is not a controlling interest as far as operating a company is concerned, but it is a controlling interest as far as the dividends are concerned, and 51 per

cent. of the profits of this corporation are coming back to the Canadian people, and I suggest to you that a very small amount of the profits will be going to the United States.

I suggest, also, that these people have to compete against the coal operators, the oil operators, and so forth; it is a competitive business, and they are not going to be able to charge double the amount for their product. That is not the way free enterprise is run.

MR. MacDONALD: Why not give hydro back to the people of Ontario?

MR. WHICHER: It is a different situation altogether.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WHICHER: I will tell you why. It is because Ontario Hydro affects the Ontario people, but this Trans-Canada pipe line affects to a large extent, the people of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, and I suggest, if we are going to nationalize anything on a Dominion basis, it should also affect the people of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and British Columbia. Hydro was nationalized because it affected all of the people of the Province of Ontario, and personally I cannot see why the Dominion of Canada should take over this pipe line, and the people of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland having to help pay for it, and yet have nothing whatever to do with it.

In closing, I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly have not lost control of our destiny to American capitalists, as has been expressed by the hon. member for York South. If this pipe line does not work out, these people who told Rt. hon. Mr. Howe to “go plump” are going to be told quite a few things in return, and will be told the truth.

We can still take this pipe line over; it can be expropriated by the Dominion Government at any time they see fit, and I suggest most humbly that the

combined brains of the Federal Government in their wisdom are trying to do the best for the people of Canada, and the Government of Ontario is undoubtedly trying to do its best for the people of this province, because they think it is a good thing—and so do I.

MR. J. W. SPOONER (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable debate in connection with this Bill as to the value of the supply of the product which will be provided by this natural gas pipe line. I think the concern of this House and of the people of Ontario and indeed, of Canada, is that every effort should be made to assist in every possible way to ensure the success of this project, and not to look upon it in the light of the views expressed yesterday by the hon. member for York South, when he said he hoped the project would fail.

Let me assure the hon. members of this House through you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of northern Ontario, whom I have the honour to represent in this House, are certainly not of that opinion. I have, for the last year or two, become interested in the matter of the supply of natural gas in northern Ontario, and the people of northern Ontario are behind this project 100 per cent.

MR. MacDONALD: But not necessarily this deal.

MR. SPOONER: I believe the federal and the provincial authorities have, in their wisdom, negotiated an agreement for the construction of the operation of this line, and I think the government of Ontario has shown the greatest interest and the highest degree of co-operation possible to ensure that Ontario will share in an all-Canadian natural gas pipe line.

Regarding the financial arrangement between the Province of Ontario, the Federal Government, and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company, I am confident the interests of Canadians will be properly safeguarded. The hon. mem-

ber for Bruce, who spoke before me, has properly enlarged on that subject, so I will not dwell on it. Certainly any corporation operating in this country is subject to our laws, rules and regulations, and certainly the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company will not be outside the scope of the laws of Canada or of any province in which they operate.

A great deal of time was spent, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the debate, by the hon. member for York South in dealing with the fact that a number of municipalities in northern and north-western Ontario had already entered into agreements for the distribution of natural gas by private corporations, and he proceeded to explain that this was all wrong, and that public ownership should construct this line.

I would like to give you a bit of history—which is certainly not ancient history by any means.

When this matter of a Trans-Canada pipe line—an all-Canadian gas pipe line—to serve Ontario was broached some years ago, a group in the municipal field in northern Ontario decided it was a project in which they should interest themselves. Those of us who were in the municipal field of government became greatly interested in this matter, and we formed an association so we could assimilate our thinking, collect data and information, and conduct the necessary studies so we would be able to furnish our people with proper information concerning the service this line might provide.

There certainly was no doubt of the benefits which would accrue to our areas in the supply of natural gas for domestic and industrial use, including the pulp and paper industry, the great industries in Kapuskasing, in Smooth Rock Falls, and in Iroquois Falls. These would be users of this type of fuel, as would the mining industry in the development of base metals in our part of the province.

The municipal people, the chambers of commerce and the boards of trade, with other interested groups representing labour organizations, banded together to conduct studies so it would

be able to provide the people with information which would assist them in understanding this proposition, and knowing something about it.

This organization had many meetings. I happened to have the honour of being one of the members of the organization, and we went to great lengths to study the matter and the location of the lines for the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company, and we made certain representations to the Board of Transport Commissioners. I am happy to tell you these representations were most successful.

We also studied the matter of the local distribution of natural gas, and came to the conclusion that the distribution of natural gas on a public-ownership basis in the municipalities at that time was not a field of endeavour in which the municipalities in our part of the country could interest themselves.

We found, for instance, that in one community it would cost approximately \$3 million to install the retail or consumer-distribution system, and, Mr. Speaker, \$3 million is more than all the capital investments which have been made in this community in over 40 years.

We were faced with thinking of the future also, not just regarding natural gas, but of providing educational facilities for the future and necessary municipal services, whether it be water, sewage systems, streets, roads or hydro, and we came to the conclusion that our municipalities would be very wise to allow private-enterprise organizations to enter into agreements with our municipalities, which agreements would be subject to the approval of a governmental body in this province. We thought it wise to do that, instead of using the credit of our municipalities to install a service which perhaps only a portion of the ratepayers would be able to use.

I am sure you are aware there are some people, in areas where natural gas is available, who do not use it for some particular reason. Certainly in a new

venture where natural gas has not been made available before, it will take a good selling job on the part of the distributor to sell it to the consumers, and it will be a job which will certainly require some time.

In a federally-owned operation, the credit of all the ratepayers and all the real estate would have been a first mortgage for a service which only a portion of the citizens would require. However, in the agreements which have been consummated with this company, there was provision that after a certain time, a municipal corporation, if it so wished, might purchase the distribution plant in the community.

Insofar as that goes, the ratepayers are properly protected, in that after the system has been in operation for some years in a municipality, it will have the right to purchase it and operate it as a public utility. That was the basis for the formation of hydro. We accept hydro today, as one hon. member said a while ago, because it is a service to all the people of Ontario.

I do not care at this time to prolong this debate in connection with this matter, except that I would like to say we have in the part of the Province of Ontario known as the "great north" a new country. The community in which I live was virgin forest 42 years ago. We think there is a great future there, and that the natural gas pipe line through northern Ontario, as well as through the southern part of this province, will be of great value to all the people of Ontario, and will assist in making of the north country a still greater place in which to live and earn a living.

All the support which can be given to this project by our government, and by this Legislature, should certainly be given, in that this provides a great opportunity for the citizens of Ontario to join in a project which will be so valuable to the whole of Canada.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of rising earlier and speaking in relation to



the Bill now before the House and I will take only a moment. But I feel it is essential, as representing an urban constituency, to place myself on record in relation to my own riding.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am in an invidious position in relation to this Bill; on the one hand, I have to support it because I think the Province of Ontario in entering into the agreement had no alternative. It was a position with which it was faced, and believing, as it does, in the progress and development of the people of this province, it was essential that the province accept the offer.

At that same time, I am not too happy in relation to it for several reasons, in regard to the terms of the contract—

MR. MacDONALD: The conscience of the Party speaking.

MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. member to be rude enough to intervene again in my speech. I tried to treat him with great courtesy when he was speaking, although I doubt very much if he would recognize it, and I would be just as pleased if he would leave me alone.

MR. MacDONALD: I shall.

MR. MACAULAY: I am speaking from my heart, not from Party dictates, and for that reason I want to speak briefly. I have some question as to this Act, from the point of the view of the contract entered into by the Dominion Government and the contracting party, because I think there are some great weaknesses. I have taken a month and a half or two months to read rather extensively in regard to this matter. I am not satisfied, in my own heart, that private ownership is the proper way to construct this line.

I appreciate what the hon. Prime Minister has said that the province has much borrowing to do in the future, and it hopes not to have to take on any more heavy expenditures, that could be borne by private industry, than neces-

sary. I think that argument is of great significance.

At the same time, I do not know that public ownership may actually be the answer. In any event, there appears to be, in the coming days, the possibility that there may be some rather extensive changes in this plan, but regardless of what changes there may be, it is to be hoped that the gas can be brought to our people. I am anxious to say that I think we have to go into this matter with certain reservations as to the procedure being followed, not as to the merits of bringing gas to this province.

For that reason I support this Bill, because I think the province was offered a situation it simply had to accept. I think it has faced up to the situation, and I think it will do everything it can to implement the agreement, but at the same time, I do feel the procedure could be fraught with certain loopholes, which may be weaknesses, and I only wanted to put myself on record in that regard.

MR. R. BELISLE (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, on the second reading of this Bill intituled, "The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act of 1956," I would like to add my support to this Bill, as I represent this great riding of Nickel Belt where the mining wealth of this province has given millions of dollars to the provincial treasury, and with the prospect of minerals increasing every day, I sincerely think it is a great step forward, not only for northern communities but for Ontario as a whole.

The \$35 million needed for this project is, to my way of thinking, a very sound investment. I am very pleased to hear that the City of Sudbury and the Township of McKim have unanimously endorsed this Bill. This project, without any doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, will stand as a monument to the foresight and good administration of this government, under the very capable leadership of our distinguished hon. Prime Minister.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words in regard to this

Bill. Originally it was not my intention to speak. Unfortunately, I was unavoidably detained, so I will take a minimum of time now.

Mr. Speaker, the position of myself and my colleagues was set out yesterday by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and therefore it is unnecessary for me to say I am in favour of this Bill. There were, however, a few things yesterday which were said by the hon. member for York South which attracted my attention, and which occurred to me at the time, which I think are worth bringing to the attention of the House.

Personally, I disagree with the suggestion of the hon. member for York South that we are selling out to American capital, and, in effect, that our free enterprise system has not served us to good advantage. It is my opinion that the increase in capital investment which is made each year in this country consists of 85 per cent. Canadian investment. Therefore, it is but a small portion of our total capital investment which is foreign; and of the balance of 15 per cent., naturally, some is from countries other than the United States. Therefore, it is in error to say that it is demonstrative of the weakness, the "selling out" of our free enterprise system to the United States.

Secondly, I would remind the House that approximately 9 nine years ago, the investment in the west in oil development was approximately \$12 million. At the present time, I believe there is being invested annually approximately \$500 million or half-a-billion dollars. It seems to me that a free enterprise system which can project that type of progress certainly does not deserve the condemnation that was suggested in this House yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with what has been said, that there are occasions when public ownership is a desirable thing. However, I do not think that public ownership is a desirable means of undertaking any project which can be undertaken by private enterprise. I firmly

believe that it is the inherent right of every man to own his own property and to do with that property as he so desires—provided, however, that he does not hurt the common good. I can see in this particular Bill no deprivation, no means of hurting the common good. I think the Bill is deserving of our support, because of the fact that the project will be undertaken privately.

Mr. Speaker, the last comment I wish to make on this Bill is with respect to the so-called agreement between the Federal Government and the Texas group. It seems to me that the members of the federal authority outside—and when I say "outside", I mean that I do not think it particularly appropriate or opportune to bring them into this matter; it is none of our legitimate concern. But in view of the fact that it has formed an integral part of the discussion in this House, I wish to say that I think the federal authorities acted very wisely, in the position in which they were, and on the premise that they were to decide whether it would be to the advantage of the country to erect a pipe line by private means, and the fact that private enterprise recognizes that the market for gas is in the eastern United States, and the fact that it is economically more attractive to construct a pipe line across the American states. I think it is something to be commended, that our federal authorities were in a position to persuade those private companies to change their minds and bring the line across our own country.

Mr. Speaker, instead of being criticized, our federal authorities should be commended for the efforts they have made to ensure that this pipe line will cross our own provinces, rather than be constructed in the United States.

As I said at the outset, unfortunately, I was detained this afternoon, and was unable to be in the House earlier. I simply wished to make those few brief remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion.

AYES: 88.

NAYS: Nil.

*YEAS*

*NAYS*

Allan  
 (Haldimand-Norfolk)  
 Auld  
 Beckett  
 Belisle  
 Boyer  
 Brandon  
 Cass  
 Cathcart  
 Cecile  
 Chaput  
 Child  
 Collings  
 Connell  
 Cowling  
 Daley  
 Dunbar  
 Dunlop  
 Dymond  
 Edwards  
 Elliott  
 Fishleigh  
 Foote  
 Frost  
 (Bracondale)  
 Frost  
 (Victoria)  
 Fullerton  
 Gisborn  
 Goodfellow  
 Gordon  
 Graham  
 Griesinger  
 Grossman  
 Hall  
 Hanna  
 Herbert  
 Hunt  
 Innes  
 Janes  
 Johnston  
 (Parry Sound)  
 Johnston  
 (Simcoe Centre)  
 Johnston  
 (Carleton)  
 Jolley  
 Kelly

*YEAS*

*NAYS*

Kennedy  
 Kerr  
 Lavergne  
 Lewis  
 Lyons  
 Macaulay  
 MacDonald  
 Mackenzie  
 Maloney  
 Manley  
 Monaghan  
 Morningstar  
 Morrow  
 Murdoch  
 Myers  
 Nickle  
 Nixon  
 Noden  
 Oliver  
 Parry  
 Patrick  
 Phillips  
 Porter  
 Price  
 Pryde  
 Rankin  
 Reaume  
 Robarts  
 Roberts  
 Robson  
 Root  
 Sandercock  
 Scott  
 Spence  
 Spooner  
 Stewart  
 Sutton  
 Thomas  
 (Elgin)  
 Thomas  
 (Oshawa)  
 Villeneuve  
 Wardrobe  
 Warrender  
 Whicher  
 Wintermeyer  
 Worton  
 Yaremko

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.



## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at the bewitching hour of 6 o'clock on Monday last, I had indicated to you—and, through you, to the members of the House—that I wished to make some reference to The Labour Relations Act, and labour relations generally in the Province of Ontario.

This is a point which may seem a lengthy one, but is vital to my constituency, and to a great part of this province. As the hon. Prime Minister has indicated to the House, 50 per cent. of the industry of this great Dominion is carried on in Ontario, approximately 40 per cent. of the labour force lives in Ontario; and 50 per cent. of all the taxes of the country are derived from Ontario.

Therefore, the future of this country depends to a very great extent upon the industrial growth of the province. In turn, that depends upon the industrial relations between its labour and management forces.

Mr. Speaker, there were certain points which I felt should be drawn to the attention of the House. When I went back and read *Hansard* to find out where I had left off, I felt I really ought to apologize to the House. I must be one of the most incoherent members, because I could not find out where I had left off. In order to obviate missing some important points, I feel that I should briefly re-commence.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I feel there should be a change in the role of the Labour Relations Board in Ontario. The Labour Relations Act as now constituted was passed several years ago, and is administered, partly, in the first instance, by the Labour Relations Board, and partly by the courts; and to a large extent supervised and administered by The Department of Labour.

The present procedure in relation to certain matters in connection with the Act is worthy of mention. Certain facets of labour relations are carried on by the Labour Relations Board. Some

of this takes place before the courts, and some within The Department of Labour itself.

That being so, I have felt for some time that the Labour Relations Board itself should be charged with the responsibility of supervising and administering all parts of The Labour Relations Act, which are administered by The Department of Labour. It has been said to me: "But how could the Labour Relations Board do some of the things which are carried on at present by the courts?"

It is not a new procedure, Mr. Speaker, with a quasi-judicial board, to petition the Supreme Court to carry out an order of the board which had been ignored or refused by the parties to whom it was addressed. Therefore, it is a simple matter for the board to be given judicial and quasi-judicial powers which are now vested in the courts.

I understand from speaking with one of the members of the board, there are not a great many cases which are taken before the board in connection with breaches of The Labour Relations Act, and before they are taken before the courts, approval must be had by the Labour Relations Board, and when it gives approval, the board listens to the matter in a very detailed way.

As I understood the chairman of the board, I believe he used these words, "more thoroughly than is customary at a preliminary hearing in a criminal matter." That being so, the board goes very deeply into the question of breaches of The Labour Relations Act.

If it goes that deeply into the facts upon which a prosecution is requested, then I feel it also should be empowered—or given the power—to deal with the completion of the application. In short, I do not think approval of an application should be asked for or taken to the Labour Relations Board in order to go to the courts. I think the board should completely deal with the matter.

The second point involves conciliation. One of the general criticisms in connection with The Labour Relations Act at the moment is that conciliation

takes too long. This is how conciliation works, for the interest of any hon. members who are listening to me, and do not already know.

If there is a dispute between a party and an employer, which cannot be settled by the parties, one of the parties may apply to the Labour Relations Board for permission to enter into what is called "conciliation" which will be handled by a conciliation officer of The Department of Labour. Before this privilege or right is given to the disputants, the Labour Relations Board satisfies itself that the disputants have done everything in their power to settle the dispute, or to negotiate between themselves.

If they are satisfied they have made an honest attempt to settle the dispute, then the board will ask The Department of Labour to appoint a conciliator. There are quite a number of conciliators on the staff of The Department of Labour, and they are able and trained men. They then enter into the picture, and if they can bring the parties together and reach an agreement, that is done. If they cannot reach an agreement through the efforts of the conciliator, then the conciliator has the power to say: "I will not recommend that this go any further, that it go to a conciliation board of 3 men. I will not recommend that."

That does not happen often, I understand. I may be wrong but I think it happened 50 times last year. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Minister of Labour if that is correct? Did that not happen approximately 50 times last year?

HON. MR. DALEY: Fifty times conciliation boards were refused.

MR. MACAULAY: Yes. The hon. Minister has indicated 50 times in the last year conciliation officers recommended against, or in any event, The Department of Labour refused conciliation boards of 3 men.

That is a power which has been given to the conciliation officers to strengthen their hands in relation to conciliation procedures. In my opinion, it is a sound one. However, if that recommendation

is not made, the dispute then goes to a conciliation board, composed of 3 men, one appointed by each party and an independent arbitrator as the third. This board then reports.

What happens is that a great deal of time elapses before a report of the conciliation board can be made available to the parties, and a strike a possibility. One of the great objections from the ranks of labour—and from management to an extent—is the time lag.

However, I would say that so long as we have in the Province of Ontario the route over which the conciliation procedure must travel, the time which now elapses will continue. There is no way I can see of shortening the time involved in conciliation, unless and until the conciliation procedure is speeded up in one of two ways.

May I say I believe there is a very strong reason for having "cooling-off" periods. I believe sometimes it is wise that some time should elapse, but it is not healthy for a great deal of time to elapse, and I think in many cases an unnecessary amount of time is elapsing.

I say this with no lack of feeling for the hon. Minister. He is the one who administers the labour legislation passed by this Legislature, which is the legislation to which I refer.

There are two delays which I think can be eliminated or reduced. Firstly an application is made initially to the Labour Relations Board asking for its approval, that the conciliation officer of The Department of Labour be brought into the picture. I think if the application were made, in the first instance, to The Department of Labour, as much as two weeks' time could be saved. Two weeks' time to men and women on the assembly line, working under today's conditions with high taxation, and cost of living, is a very important thing, when one realizes the small amount of savings which it may have been possible for them to accumulate.

There is a second way in which the procedure can be stepped up, in my opinion, and that is by cutting out

3-men conciliation boards altogether; thus having a conciliation board consist of the conciliation officer. The parties will know, when they utilize his services, and he discusses the problems with them, that there is no court of further jurisdiction to handle cases, and that this is the only step they can take, which means they have to settle or go on strike.

I feel—and I may be criticized for saying so—that there are some disputants who have gone into conciliation knowing there was another body to which they could go, and had determined they would go that far at least. I feel that in some cases strikes could be avoided, and settlements could be obtained in a shorter time and with less devastation, if applications were made in the first instance to The Department of Labour rather than to the Labour Relations Board; and I repeat that labour conciliation boards should consist of a conciliator only, rather than 3 men.

Mr. Speaker, I feel those are the issues in relation to conciliation, but there are several other matters in connection with it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the labour field there are those who might say if a 3-man conciliation board were “wiped out” and the conciliator himself would be the court of last resort before a strike, the conciliator would not be as free an impartial arbitrator, in view of the fact he would have to make a report.

I do not give credence to that. I have heard the argument and it did not sway me. I do not see why he cannot use his best efforts to bring the parties together and, having heard all the issues, make his report. I do not think he will be any less an effective intervening force.

In connection with the conciliators as they are now—and I would say this with special emphasis to the hon. Minister of Labour—that as it stands now, if this government is to leave 3-man conciliation boards still under the ambit of The Labour Relations Act, I only wish some greater prestige and power could be placed in the hands of the conciliators of The Department of Labour.

I feel if they had greater jurisdiction in relation to refusing an application to go on to conciliation boards, that fewer would go, and a great many of their problems—or at least some of them—could be settled at the hands of the conciliation officer.

That brings me to two points, Mr. Speaker. One is in relation to the General Motors strike. I do not think too much attention can be paid to the devastation which resulted directly or indirectly from that strike; but, on the other hand, too much emphasis can be placed upon it as an atypical or typical case. I think that strike arose under a peculiar set of circumstances—and by “peculiar” I do not mean “odd”, I mean “unusual”. I believe it was 5 years since the last agreement, and there were a great many differences which had developed between the two parties.

The parties mean nothing to me. I know nothing more of their problems than I have read in the newspapers, and I have no more information than any other hon. member of this House.

However, from reading extensively on the subject, I feel it was not a typical situation, around which all the legislation of this province should be developed. We should not concede for a moment because our Labour Relations Act was not able to avoid, or correct within a moment or two, the General Motors strike, that The Labour Relations Act of the Province of Ontario is inadequate, because that is not so. The number of disputes which have arisen amounted to 1,076 in the year 1953-54, of which only about 190 went to conciliation boards, and of which only 85 went on strike. Of these 85, more than 35 were settled within 3 days, so, I would say The Labour Relations Act is an excellent Act. It is an Act which has been well tried and well proven.

I have heard the hon. Prime Minister in this House on numerous occasions say—and I was particularly impressed with his presentation before the Gordon Commission some weeks ago—when he said that in his opinion the philosophy of the future, 10, 15 or 25 years from



now, must be a fresh approach. As I understood him, we must grow to new horizons, and not constantly have our eyes cast back over our shoulders. As I feel the Act may have been an excellent vehicle along the road of industrial development, in which personnel, management, and labour have travelled, I feel in the coming years there should be consideration given to The Labour Relations Act, in an effort to keep it constantly up-to-date. Several of the points which I have put to this House might assist in doing just that.

Dealing with conciliators: I am of the opinion that some courses could be offered at the University of Toronto and the Law School, to personnel in The Department of Labour, in relation to conciliation and labour disputes. I grant you the men in the department may be well versed in all aspects of the matter, but I feel that none of us has reached the stage where those who deal constantly with some of the legislative aspects could not be of some advantage to these men. I feel that if a series of short refresher courses were offered each year, it would be to their advantage. I also think if conciliation is to result in a one-man board a conciliator could be brought in from time to time, on a temporary basis, from outside the department.

There are now conciliators and arbitrators used outside The Department of Labour. With great respect to the hon. Minister, I think they have performed an excellent service, much to the credit of the hon. Minister, but it seems to me they are under-paid. You cannot hope to give to the 3 men on a board a different salary, because it happens to be a very important matter, of such a nature that it could go to a conciliation board. One member, simply because he is a judge, gets more than twice as much as the others; in fact, he receives more than both of the others combined. With the greatest respect, I submit he is not worth twice as much as the others. One man is not worth twice as much as another man, when in importance, salaries are being considered.

I want to return to another matter regarding a recent decision of the Labour Relations Board, which was made in connection with the General Motors strike, some months ago. It deals with The Labour Relations Act, sections 59 and 60. The Labour Relations Board some weeks ago had an application before it to have a strike declared illegal. I think it is unfortunate I should have to say again the parties were no concern of mine. However, a question of principle arose in this matter which is this: several weeks ago an application was made to have a strike declared illegal, and next week or next month there may be an application brought to have a lock-out declared illegal. I feel that when a party, be it a company or a union, makes an application to the Labour Relations Board for a declaration that a strike or a lock-out is illegal, that company or that union is entitled to a clear cut answer.

Here is the issue, and it is a very important one. The chairman of the Labour Relations Board has not said that the strike is legal or illegal. He has said only the circumstances do not warrant him saying whether the strike is legal or illegal. There is a very great difference, a very great difference indeed. I would have had no quarrel with the chairman of that board if he had declared that strike to be legal. It does not make any difference to me at all.

It is the principle of this matter, that the Labour Relations Board is set up under sections 59 and 60, to determine the very issue brought before it, and it did not do it. It said that the circumstances did not warrant making the declaration asked for. They do not say, "The strike is legal, therefore, we will not give you the declaration," or "It is illegal"; they simply have said, "The circumstances do not warrant giving a declaration and we are not giving it."

However they never decided the issue, so I do not know what it might have been. A great many people are concerned about this.

I differed, as I said the other day, quite radically with an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, and I shall come back to that. It appeared quite some time ago. However, let me read a few lines from an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of February 13:

Let them—

referring to this House,

Let them contemplate further the truly extraordinary fact that this longest and costliest walk-out in Canada's history ran to its end without anybody knowing whether it was legal or illegal. There was an application brought for that very purpose, but an answer was never given. The company made two efforts to get a decision on the matter from the Ontario Labour Relations Board, but the body refused to commit itself. While the battle raged on, it hid in the cellar.

I do not lend my name to that phraseology but at the same time I do feel that an application was properly brought before the Labour Relations Board for a declaration that the strike was illegal. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for management, but I represent a very large—very large indeed—industrial riding and I am concerned for my people. I suggest that next time an application may be brought by people whom I represent, asking that a “lock-out” be declared illegal. If, then, the board exercises the same power it apparently feels, it will say: “We are sorry, we are not going to tell you.”

I hate to think what would happen to our jurisprudence if a plaintiff and a defendant went to court and, when they got there, the court had the power to say to either of them: “We do not know whether you are right or wrong, but we are going to dismiss your case. But do not feel badly that we are dismissing it, because maybe you are right. Nevertheless, we are going to dismiss it.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is the situation. Perhaps it is a childish analogy, perhaps it is the kind that should never have been made, nevertheless it is an analogy, and

I say, Mr. Speaker, that sections 59 and 60 of The Labour Relations Act, in my opinion, should be amended to provide that the Labour Relations Board shall, if it finds the circumstances are such that a strike or a lock-out is legal or illegal, make the declaration for which the parties are asking. The parties should not be required to go on from that board to the courts, because that is what the board is there for. They should not have to go on to the courts to obtain a declaration that the board should have acted, which is what they would have to do.

I think it is fair also to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference of opinion on this subject, and I may be wrong. I have been wrong before, and I shall be wrong again, but I can only say that I feel that is a proper and a just interpretation. Under this section as it reads now, I think the board may have been quite justified in doing what it did. I simply say this, that the Act, if it does or does not justify what they have done, should be amended to provide that when an application is made, the board has no discretion, in effect, to put it off, but they must decide whether a strike or a lock-out is legal or illegal and so declare. The parties should not be forced to enter into protracted litigation to secure an answer which should have been obtained from the board in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn, if I may, to the Teamsters' Union in Ontario. In doing so, I am not going to take a great deal of the time of this House, but I do want to make some reference to two articles to which I hope some hon. members of the House will refer.

One is an article contained on page 11 of the *Financial Post* of November 19, 1955. The headline reads:

HOW TEAMSTERS' UNION TEARS AT  
THE HEART OF INDUSTRY

And the sub-heading is:

WHAT THE U.S. PROBERS FOUND IN  
THIS RACKET-RIDDEN UNION

I should also like to refer hon. members to what is rather a highly-excitabile

article—but which certainly contains much truth, I am sure—appearing in the *Reader's Digest*, I believe in one of the most recent editions. It concerns much the same matter and I am sure hon. members know there have been many articles appearing in many Ontario newspapers in connection with this particular union.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I wish to make reference to the Teamsters' Union is that it is one of the most important—if not the most important—in Ontario for this reason: the hon. Prime Minister said before the Gordon Commission, and has said on many occasions in this House, and as also appears in the report of the Gordon Commission, and as has been said by the hon. Minister of Highways, the highways network in this province is one of the most important and ancillary arms of the development of our industry, and will be increasingly so during the next 25 years.

It is, therefore, no wonder that something like \$2.5 billion, or some such figure—I cannot recall, they are all so large—must be secured and handed over for the development of our highway system. In short, our highways are our second, but perhaps most important, form of transportation, and without that method of communication, without doubt industry would be stifled. It follows then that those who carry the goods and wares of our industry on the highways and byways and in our cities, of necessity are of vital concern to the people of this country.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the constitution of the Teamsters' Union. This union is divided into 3 spheres. Eastern Canada and eastern United States is in Group 1, central Canada and central United States in Group 2, and western Canada and western United States in Group 3.

There is a man in Detroit who is very influential in relation to the central area in which Ontario is found. I refer to Mr. Hoffa. The reason I mention the Teamsters' Union is that something has happened in relation to that union which could happen to other unions, and I feel that it is important enough to bring

to the attention of the House, and also to that of the hon. Minister of Labour who is not unaware of the situation.

The Teamsters' Union has in the last few years developed, if not a general practice, in any event widespread enough to become, I feel, quite serious, and that is of putting some of its locals under a trustee, or what is called "in receivership". When they do that, they suspend the constitution, as it applies to that local, the membership and the executive step aside, and a trustee runs the local. He handles the money and makes all the decisions. There is no vote held, there are no elections, there is no management, except by this one man.

The trustee of 4 of the 10 locals of the Teamsters' Union in Ontario is a man by the name of Hoffa, a resident of the United States, residing in the City of Detroit. As I understand it, there is a decision of The Labour Relations Board dated 1952, in the matter of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the A. H. Boulton Co. Limited, wherein the board clearly construed that the status required to secure rights under the Act is a condition precedent to their confirmation by the board. By necessary implication, that status must be a status within the jurisdiction.

That being so, an organization, to be entitled to the status of a trade union under the Act, must be a trade union existent in Ontario. The only executive person in 4 locals is an American resident and, if the Labour Relations Board was to have followed their own decision rendered in 1952, I would submit that so long as an American resident is the only representative of a local, that it is improperly constituted until there is another person who is a Canadian representative, to have certified it.

But the problem, I feel, is this, Mr. Speaker, that any local of the Teamsters' Union, or for that matter any other union, should not be placed indefinitely—and I am most anxious not to be misunderstood on that, because I expect to have a lot of this thrown back



at me, and quoted out of context—I do not feel that any local should be put indefinitely into trusteeship. I feel that the attitude in relation to the 4 locals of the Teamsters' Union which have been put into trusteeship is that they have become part of Mr. Hoffa's empire, and that he rules them, not like, but as, a dictator.

There are occasions when locals of unions should be put into trusteeship. Circumstances can arise where such a step is necessary, and all international unions and all Canadian unions, in my humble opinion, should have power in their constitution—and I believe all of them do have—to put a local into trusteeship or receivership.

Those circumstances can be many. Sometimes a union as a whole will enter into a contract with an entire industry and then one local will “kick over the traces” and refuse to honour that contract. The only way that local can be forced to abide by the contract is that its privileges may be suspended, and it is put into trusteeship and one man runs it to see that, until proper control is returned to the membership, the matter remains in its *status quo*, in a receivership.

There are other circumstances where, for example, local officers might abscond with the funds of the local and deprive the union members in that local of their own treasury. Under such circumstances, until the funds can be returned and the books re-organized, and so forth, it is only right that the union should be able to place that local in trusteeship, under one man.

I think there are many other instances where such a procedure is justified. I am not for a moment attempting to delineate them all, I am simply attempting to indicate and to justify that trusteeships are wise.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is wise if they are made permanent. I think the circumstances which warrant them being brought about, should also warrant some supervision, at some stage, to determine whether they should be continued or not. I do not

feel that this government or any government should interfere with the internal management of any union, any more than it interferes in the internal management of management itself in industry. But I do feel, because of the broad approach which governments are taking in the field of the humanities, and the protection which is given in relation to women working, equal pay and hours, and the question of anti-discrimination and other things, that we must have some awareness and some interest in protecting the rights of individuals, within certain ambits, to pursue their own policies and their own channels in which to earn their living.

At some stage, there should be certain safeguards for union membership which wishes to get out of trusteeship. I am not advocating, Mr. Speaker—and I want it to be so understood—that I am not, *not*—advocating that this government should intervene at this stage and tell Mr. Hoffa, the Teamsters' Union or any other union that they cannot go into trusteeship or that its locals must be taken out of trusteeship. But I do say that this government, I believe, has a responsibility for making it clear that some responsibility must be taken by the union movement as a whole to protect the interests of all individual union members, and that they must make sure that they keep their own houses clean, before they ask others to assist them, by way of legislation.

The cleaning up of this matter is a responsibility of the union movement itself. I feel at the same time that the union movement should be encouraged to understand that if there are abuses by these trusteeships, the government will have to intervene.

One of the ways it could be cured, if labour will not cure it itself, is that a union might put a local under trusteeship but to last for 6 months only, and not to last beyond 6 months unless the union went to the Labour Relations Board and, upon proving the necessity of continuing, obtain its *fiat*, permission or order to continue. Otherwise it would expire. I am not—and again I say *not*—advocating that, I am simply saying that

it is one of the possible solutions when dealing with the matter.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other general matters to which I wish to refer. First of all, in connection with labour itself there has been quite an agitation in some newspaper articles which I have read, and of which I have heard persons make mention, as to the necessity or desirability of incorporating labour unions.

I think perhaps it is unnecessary to say so, but I am opposed to incorporating labour unions for two reasons. First, there is nothing that can be done *contra* or in connection with a labour union or any member thereof, under an incorporated labour union. I submit, that cannot now be done; and, secondly, we allow businesses to operate in an unincorporated state and I see no reason, therefore, why organizations of men who together are attempting to improve their working conditions should of necessity be incorporated. I see no reason for it and am opposed to it, and I simply want to put myself on record in connection with it.

Secondly, there has been current discussion about government supervised pre-strike votes and current-strike votes. The hon. Minister of Labour spoke about this matter the other day. He is opposed to it and so am I, for the same reasons which he stated.

What can you vote on during a strike? What issue could you possibly put before the voters of a union, or of management? What could possibly be put before them to decide? Secondly, it is inherently contrary to the whole concept of conciliation, and of Canadians being able to work out their own destiny.

Pre-strike and current-strike votes at one time rather appealed to me. I felt that there might be something in them. There seemed to be some logic in them, that persons should have the right, in the midst of the dispute, to express their views.

However, again there is a constitution for that Union, and we are bound by our constitutions and so are other groups bound by theirs, and their consti-

tution provides a way in which they can express their views as to the conduct of their own affairs by their union organizers, and I feel that, for a moment, the matter should be left at the stage that government supervised current or pre-strike votes are things in which this province and this government should not, in any way, engage.

Thirdly, there has been much discussion about the question of compulsory arbitration. The hon. Minister also referred to this and I am opposed to it, as was he. I remember very well when I worked on the assembly line in one of the motor car companies in Windsor, the feelings I had in relation to my job, and the things which had to be done, and which were required of me. I know the feeling of my own constituents is that they would be strongly opposed to compulsory arbitration. I hope that the hon. Minister and I will never have any part in seeing such a thing brought about in this province.

There is a fourth matter, however, I have heard discussed in my own riding among union men, and that is, that when an award is made before conciliation or by a conciliation board, the effect of it should be retroactive to the time the strike began.

With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that also is anything into which the government can enter, for this reason, that the parties know when they enter into a contract, that at the expiry of the contract, they will either have to negotiate a new contract, or go through conciliation proceedings, after which a strike is the final step. And when they enter into the first contract, they are well able to provide, Mr. Speaker, that when that contract shall expire, and if they do have to go on strike, whatever award comes out of the strike would still be applicable from the date the contract expired. The parties themselves can do that, and I do not think, if we are to reserve to the parties certain freedom of action within the ambit of the law, we should circumscribe them with conditions of this nature, any more than we do others.

The fifth matter of some importance is a question of *ex parte* injunctions. I believe the labour movement as a whole feels concerned about the power of an applicant before the Supreme Court to obtain what is called an "*ex parte* injunction" on the grounds of affidavit evidence only. It is not opposed, and no notice is given to the union, when an application is made by management. I do not suppose there are many applications brought by a union; I cannot think of the circumstances under which one could be made, but it might be possible.

*Ex parte* means "one party", the court issues a mandatory order that there shall be none of this or that, and yet the court has only heard one side of the story, the side put before it in the affidavit of the applicant. Granted, an *ex parte* injunction only runs 3 days, or something of that nature, but in that 3 days it can do a tremendous amount of damage to the labour movement.

It seems to me *ex parte* injunctions have been "dignified"—if that word can be used—by a great many decades. I do not know how far back into antiquity they go, but certainly they go back a great many years indeed, and I doubt very much whether the government should in any way interfere, but I do feel they should be watched, and where and if they are abused it may be necessary at that stage for some form of intervention.

In conclusion, I only want to again make some reference to the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 14. I think this was a very excellent editorial. In the last paragraph reference is made to the fact that the General Motors strike was a great failure, and if big unions and big companies do not get together and stop wasteful strikes and try to prevent them in the future—unless they find some answer—they will invite a clamour for restrictive laws. I think there is some merit in that. I think that is one side of the picture which is an intelligent and proper view to take in relation to the Act, because, as I said before, I do not think there is an Act which could have been drawn by this or any other Legislature which could have stopped or

made impossible the General Motors strike, unless it had been an Act which said, "There shall be no strike," and we have not yet reached that stage in this province.

I shall not remain in this House in any other capacity than to oppose anything like that. The General Motors strike was an unfortunate one. The *Globe and Mail* made reference to it and calls it a "senseless struggle" and so forth.

I think in many ways it might have been a difficult strike, it might have been a damaging one, but it was not a "senseless" one. There was a great issue between very large organizations and they fought out matters of great principle in the same way that great issues are fought out on election day throughout this country, year in and year out.

In my humble opinion, The Labour Relations Act is a very fine Act indeed, administrated by capable people. There are some very well trained men in The Department of Labour, but none more so than the hon. Minister. Some of these men taught me in law school, and I have known them for some time, and they are able men. I do not on all occasions agree with what these men say, in fact, in some of the things I have said this afternoon I disagree violently with them, "violently" in the sense of words only.

I see the hon. member for York South has signified his presence in the House during my speech by reading or writing, when he wasn't reading—

MR. MacDONALD: I have been listening; I have heard every word you said, and I have agreed with so much of it that I am a bit overwhelmed at the moment, and that is the reason for my silence.

MR. MACAULAY: That is fine.

MR. MacDONALD: It sounds like a rebellion on the "Tory" back benches.

MR. MACAULAY: There is no "rebellion" in this at all, I would not like to think the hon. member has passed an iron curtain around our Party so



that no one is entitled to an individual thought.

This does not constitute a "rebellion," simply because this afternoon I have my own convictions for the necessity of standing up and saying I felt there was some question about the ultimate agreements of the working out of a gas pipe line arrangement. I believe in it in principle, I do not think the government feels any different in relation to it than I do, and I also think the government is interested in the question of The Labour Relations Act and the labour movement in this province. I am quite satisfied of this.

I have read in the newspapers recently of Acts which people are threatening to bring into this House, to present to the hon. members of this House, and I say if you think so badly of The Labour Relations Act, then draw up your own Act and bring it in, and let us have a look at it, because you will not bring anything in that can compare with what we have.

MR. MacDONALD: A rare and welcome instance of independence.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, for the last few years, a number of select committees have been appointed to enquire into various matters, and after travelling many miles, holding countless meetings, hearings, and receiving briefs, they have reported back to this House. One of these committees was the cemetery committee, which was appointed because of irregularities which were occurring in the cemetery business.

It is about 3 years since that committee reported back to this House, so I was rather surprised to read in the *Globe and Mail* last week that private profiteering on cemeteries is claimed by the church, and the church which makes this statement is the Anglican Church of Canada.

Another select committee whose report has been received by the Legislature, and which I think the government is moving too slowly on, is the report of the Select Committee on Highway Safety. Some of the recommendations

are of importance, and could be very well implemented now or in the near future. One of them—which I think is a very important recommendation—was that a standing committee of this Legislature be appointed at each session. That was No. 6 in the report, and to emphasize that in the addendum of the report it states:

We again would like to emphasize the importance of a standing committee of the House to consider highway safety.

I do not know what reason can be given for that committee not to have been appointed. It could very easily, as I have said, have been appointed, and could have been doing some very desirable work in this session.

The report also recommended that a highway safety department be established, administered by a director who would have the status and rank of Deputy Minister, a separate examination to be established under the director. That is No. 7 in the report and in subsection "a", it states:

Driver examiners be appointed as civil servants.

Subsection "b" states:

An applicant for the position of driver-examiner be required to pass a qualifying examination consisting in part of appropriate written and practical tests.

However, we are still appointing examiners and giving licences in the same old way. Yet, in recommendation No. 14, we find:

An applicant for a licence to drive a motor vehicle be required to pass a complete examination to satisfy the examiner that he is competent to operate a motor vehicle.

This examination should be designed to certify that the successful applicant has reasonable eyesight, understands highway signs, possesses a thorough knowledge of the highway traffic laws and regulations and has the ability to drive safely.

How does an examiner know if the applicant has reasonable eyesight? He has no standards, of which I know, and just has to guess. Even the examiners have had no tests of their eyesight, as I have good reason to believe.

I read a news report recently where a man was charged with an infraction of The Highway Traffic Act, and it came out in the evidence given before the magistrate that he had only been in this country two months, and did not understand traffic signs, and the magistrate said this man should have a driver's test. I have the news report here. The question is, how did he get his licence in the first place?

In Barrie, on January 11, a Canadian Press report says that auto distributor James L. Cooke said the Ontario Government had passed horse-and-buggy type traffic laws. He told the Simcoe County Auto Dealers' Association that the business of testing drivers and issuing licences should be taken from the hands of political appointees and given to the Ontario Provincial Police. Driving licence examiners, he declared, receive appointments through political patronage and not because of their ability. Mr. Cooke also said that some licence issuers would fail a good test themselves.

The London *Free Press*, in an editorial, stated the main cause of highway accidents is faulty driving, and that tightening of tests given drivers is an obvious first step.

The Brantford *Expositor*, in an editorial, states that tests as presently conducted allow many an unfit person to get behind the wheel.

A Toronto *Daily Star* editorial of December 31 states that anyone in the province can get a driving licence.

In nearly every brief submitted to the Committee on Highway Safety, we were told our examination for a driver's permit was inefficient. One brief stated that 50 per cent. of applicants for drivers' licences received a poor examination.

Mr. Speaker, it is well that the enforcement officer enforces The Traffic

Act on our highways, but I think it goes deeper than that, and we should start at the foundation of things and see that, when a man receives a permit to drive, he has had a good examination and is capable of driving safely. The report also states:

Consideration of adopting standards to prohibit projections and projecting ornaments which would be dangerous in the event of an accident.

That was something we considered very strongly, but I know we still have cars being manufactured which are dangerous. You have only to look at the parking lots full of new cars to see that what we, as a committee, objected to are still being manufactured. I have a very interesting news article here, which was presented before the California Academy of General Practice. I cut this out of the newspaper while with the committee in the United States. It says:

"If auto designers would spend only two weeks in an emergency hospital," said Dr. Donald G. Thompson of Los Angeles, committee chairman, "their consciences would not allow them to design cars with knife-edge visors projecting over headlights, hood ornaments that spear their victims, bumpers and grills that masticate pedestrians and children on bicycles."

One committee member told of seeing a single "earring" on a woman traffic victim. After an operation, he said, he found the piece of metal was the end of an eight-inch hood ornament imbedded in her neck, protruding below the ear. The woman died.

"Despite the fact that there were 3,104 deaths in California alone last year due to auto accidents," the report went on, "the public has come to accept such appalling figures with only mild, impersonal concern, apparently taking the attitude that they are inevitable."

"There is no question," it said, "that countless lives could be saved by better design."

Coming nearer to home, just recently a car ran into some school children, I believe it was in Hamilton, and in this accident the hood ornament punctured a boy's liver. No doubt many of the hon. members in this House have known of injuries such as this in their own community. As the report in section 64 states:

A safety section in the Department of Highways investigate and establish vehicle standards and approve accessories.

The time is long past due when a number of the recommendations which were brought in by the Select Committee on Highway Safety should be implemented.

When a magistrate suspends a driver's licence for an infraction of The Highway Traffic Act, there should be no delay in sending the licence and the information to the department here. When those suspended licences are held in the magistrate's office, in many cases it causes an extreme hardship to many drivers.

To illustrate what I mean, I know a young man who owns and operates a dump truck for hauling gravel. He was driving it on one of our highways and was following an empty truck too closely, and when the empty truck stopped suddenly, he had a rear end collision, which was only a minor one. He was charged with careless driving and his licence was suspended for 14 days.

At the expiration of the 14 days, he applied for his licence and was told that he would have to write the department here, which he did. He also had his insurance company write in, to say that he was fully insured.

What happened? On December 23 he received a letter from the department telling him to send in his licence plates. This was a month after the suspension, which was only for 14 days.

The point I want to make is that the magistrate's clerk did not send this man's licence into the department here until 11 days after the suspension. It

would not arrive here for at least another day. I feel that there should be no delay in sending these licences to the department. In this case it caused a great hardship to this young man as he was unable to follow his employment and earn his living.

I wrote to the department on December 21, and received his licence on December 24—30 days after a suspension of only 14 days.

I believe that when the Select Committee on Highway Safety was in Harrisburg, Pa., we were told that a person upon being convicted of speeding, automatically has his licence suspended for 90 days. If he needed his permit to earn his living, and enable him to work at his profession or business, he could apply immediately to a board, and if his previous record was good he could be granted a temporary permit for the 90 days.

I understand it is a different permit from the regular one, and I think is red in colour. However it is a permit to drive and he is able to carry on his business, or follow his profession. That might be something for the department here to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by a number of citizens of Brantford—and I have a number of letters here, and also a number of organizations have requested me to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. members of this House—to ask that the government give consideration to the purchase of a property known as White's Bush. Someone told me today that the government is giving consideration to this matter. However, I will carry on with the statement I have and which was prepared some weeks ago.

I know that a number of briefs have been presented to the Cabinet, and also that some members of the Cabinet have received letters from interested citizens.

This property known as White's Bush is a 344-acre tract of land situated in Malahide Township in Elgin County not far from St. Thomas. Approximately 167,300 people reside within a 20-mile radius of this property. There



are 294 acres of forest and I am told there are few woodlands in southern Ontario which can rival White's Bush in the size and variety of the trees.

There is white pine and some of these trees are over 200 years old. One of these trees was measured and found to be 38 inches in diameter and 125 feet tall. There are also pure stands of beech; many of these trees are over 150 years old and 100 feet tall. There are also red oak, white oak, black oak and many other varieties. There is a wide variety of plants and shrubs which have attracted botanists from far and near.

White's Bush has long been an attraction for amateur and professional bird lovers, and a variety of both rare and common species of birds can be relied upon to be present.

This woodland contains the only observed nesting colony of the hooded warbler. This bush is considered one of the outstanding bird sanctuaries, and its preservation would encourage the continued existence of many of the rarer birds of southern Ontario.

There is a 20-acre mill pond on this property and it is claimed that there is to be found there some of the best bass fishing of any waters in southern Ontario.

It is also claimed to be free of coarse fish.

There is a good selection of native mammals of Ontario to be found here, such as muskrats, beaver, deer, red fox, raccoon and flying squirrels, to name a few. The clear waters of the pond provide excellent swimming, canoeing and boating. Hundreds of people every summer enjoy a swim in the old pond.

By the short description I have given, it can be seen that this property would make one of the finest parks in this part of the province. Combined with the forest and pond, there is also a 30-acre area which could be used as a playground and picnic area. Someone may ask why a number of people and organizations in Brantford, who are interested in this property, feel it should be purchased by the government. One of the reasons is that this bush is one of the

few stands of virgin timber left in this part of Ontario, and, as such, it could be of great scientific, educational and recreational value. It is a naturalist's paradise and many suggestions have been made as to its use.

The purchase and preservation of White's Bush has been officially endorsed by the Grand River Anti-Pollution Group, the Brantford Rod and Gun Club, The Ontario Anglers' and Hunters' Association, and the local branch of the Nature Clubs of Ontario.

I have here an editorial from the *London Free Press*, but I will not read it.

Another reason why I have been requested to bring this matter before the Legislature is that the owner of this property is over 80 years of age and is eager that the government should take over the property. He will not sell it to private interests. It is felt that should the property get out of the hands of Mr. White, it could be that the lumber interests, who are only too willing and anxious, would move in and then this splendid and stately property would be lost to the people of Ontario forever.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should say a few words about the operations of the Municipal Board.

This board was set up during the 1930's for a special purpose. Many of our municipalities were in financial difficulties and this board has been of assistance to them. As the years have gone by, this board has been given much wider authority over municipal governments.

Councils and planning boards have not the say as to what they believe is best for them. One case in point, I believe last year was that the city council and planning board of Sarnia decided that a certain property should be used for a local shopping centre, and who would know better than the local government as to what best use property in their city could be put?

Owners of a supermarket with head offices in Toronto became interested in this property and decided they would like to locate there. Being "big business"

they were able to use their influence, and the upshot was that the Municipal Board reversed what the city council and local planning board considered was the best use of this property, and the result was the building of a huge supermarket.

A report in the Brantford *Expositor* of a meeting of the board of governors of the General Hospital stated that the Ontario Municipal Board's charges for supporting by-laws raised at least one eyebrow. Presenting the building committee's report, the committee chairman noted that the Municipal Board had charged \$1,400 for approving a by-law for a hospital building and charged \$280 tariff fee for ratifying the debenture by-law.

"It would seem to me that the Municipal Board receives quite a sum of money out of Ontario communities," the chairman remarked. It may be that it costs a lot of money to approve a by-law but I feel that \$1,680 is quite an expense to "saddle" on a hospital. It is felt by municipal governments that there is too much interference with local problems by this board, and it would be interesting to know how much money is received from municipalities and hospitals, etc., by this board.

On January 11, the Brantford city council passed a resolution—a copy of which was sent to me—requesting that the government give serious consideration to an increase in the old age pension, commensurate with the requirements of many of those citizens who have no other income, and are finding it impossible to procure the necessities of life with the \$40 a month they now receive.

It is stated by the Public Health Department of Toronto that old-age pensioners need at least \$20 more than the \$40 they receive from the Federal Government, and the same amount from the Provincial Government for those 65 to 69, 50 per cent. of which is paid by the Federal Government. This pension,

of course, is given only on a means test. Other provinces, as you know, do make supplementary payments, and one thing is certain, the present amount, where a pensioner has no other income than the \$40 a month, is insufficient to provide the pensioner with the plain necessities of life. Surely we, the richest province in Canada, can at least match the supplementary payments made by other provinces.

I know that at the present time old age pensioners in need can apply to the welfare department in their locality and receive a supplementary payment of \$10 a month, \$5 of this must be paid by the municipality. But not all of these people know that, and a number of them have come to me in very dire circumstances, when they were not able to carry on, and when I told them they would have to go to their welfare department to receive money for medicine or rent, they immediately associated it with the relief department. A number of them have told me, "I am not going to the relief department. I have never had to ask for relief in my life, and at my age I am not going to start now."

I think we all know what it means for people to be able to buy the necessities of life. There were some articles which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* and which they have made into a booklet. I do not know what they call the booklet, but it could be called, "How to Live Like a Bird on \$40 a Month." That would be a good title for it.

I think it is time we gave some consideration to assisting our old people with a supplementary pension of at least \$20 a month.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 of the clock p.m.



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, February 23, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, February 23, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Third report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....  | 447 |
| Ontario Water Resources Commission, Bill to establish, Mr. Frost, first reading ..  | 447 |
| Fire Departments Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading .....   | 448 |
| Agricultural Societies Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....  | 450 |
| Brucellosis Control Act, 1953, Bill to amend, Mr. Thomas, first reading .....   | 450 |
| Homes for the Aged Act, 1955, Bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading .....  | 450 |
| Charitable Institutions Act, 1956, Bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, first reading .....  | 451 |
| Power Commission Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, first reading .....   | 451 |
| Niagara Development Act, 1951, Bill to amend, Mr. Warrender, first reading ....   | 451 |
| St. Lawrence Development Act, 1952 (No. 2), Bill to amend,<br>Mr. Warrender, first reading .....                          | 452 |
| Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne,<br>Mr. Dymond, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Wintermeyer, Mr. Warrender, ..... | 454 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to .....  | 478 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....  | 479 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Yaremko from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presented the committee's third report and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 12, An Act respecting the Town of Timmins.

Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill No. 35, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill No. 38, An Act respecting Assumption College.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 38, An Act respecting Assumption College.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) JOHN YAREMKO  
Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

Hon. L. M. Frost moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Ontario Water Resources Commission."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in giving to the House a brief explanation of this Bill, may I say that this Bill is very important and far-reaching, dealing with a problem which is fundamental to this province. It is aimed at ending the possibility of the water shortage in southwestern Ontario, and also a conception which was not apparent when the original committee appointed a year ago, that of ending the pollution problem in this province.

The Act itself is modelled after the original Act introduced in this House almost 45 years ago, which Act provided for the establishment of the present Hydro-Electric Power System. As a matter of fact, the Act, in its present form, contains some of the provisions of that original Act.

Its implications are very great. It provides the method by which the problems of water and pollution may be dealt with on an area basis.

It also provides for the investment of public monies—not in stated amounts as in the Bill—but in very large amounts, I can assure hon. members, which will be available for this development over the years. That will provide the means for the retirement of the

debts incurred. The monies will be advanced under a service or assessment system. Nevertheless, it will involve the credit of the province in a very large way.

Mr. Speaker, in the report which is now public property, it was estimated that over the next 20 years, the expenditures on the water problem alone will probably amount to something in the nature of \$2.5 billion. In this Assembly, we have acquired the habit of speaking of "billions of dollars", in the way we formerly spoke of "millions." Mr. Speaker, when I say that \$2.5 billion which is \$2,500 million, you can see the extent to which the credit of the province will be invested in the future of this great province in providing for the needs of the people and of industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and a very fundamental Bill. It provides for the appointment of a commission. I think it is proper for me to say that I hope to be able to persuade Mr. M. A. Snyder, of Waterloo, to accept the chairmanship, and I think I will be successful in doing so. Mr. Snyder is a business man and industrialist of note and has, in the past year, devoted a great deal of his time and talents to the study of this problem.

It is very interesting to tell the House that Mr. Snyder is the grandson of the original Mr. Snyder who was one of the originators of the present Ontario Hydro Electric system. It is always of interest to me that Mr. Snyder, and afterwards Sir Adam Beck—and a few others—managed to meet in what is now the City of Kitchener, in the well-known Walper Hotel, and they and some others—probably unknown to themselves—laid the foundation for that great system of power across this province.

It is with a very great deal of pleasure I will invite the grandson of one of our citizens, who contributed so greatly to the establishment of that great power system of Ontario, to take part in this new development, which is necessitated by the growth which is ours in Ontario.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Would the hon. Prime Minister say how many members will be on the commission?

HON. MR. FROST: The Bill provides for not less than 3, nor more than 5.

## THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of this Bill, I will on second reading go into the principles involved in more detail; but I think it would be advisable at this time to point out certain amendments provided for in this Bill.

One amendment provides that a fire fighter will be entitled to a hearing before being dismissed, if he requests it. Then there are several amendments included in this Bill, designed to expedite collective bargaining. The Bill provides that when requested in writing by a majority of the full-time fire fighters, the council of a municipality shall, within 90 days after receipt of such request, commence to bargain. I would like to emphasize that means that the commencement must occur within the period of 90 days after the request is forwarded.

There is provision that within 14 days after commencement—having agreed to commence to bargain—the appointment of the required arbitrators has to be completed. Then, having set up the Board of Arbitration, the board is required to commence the arbitration proceedings within 30 days after it has been constituted, and is required to deliver its decision or award within 60 days after the commencement of the arbitration proceedings. Extensions of time are permitted by agreement of the parties, or consent being given by the Attorney-General.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Orders of the day at this time, and then we can revert to the introduction of Bills?



MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have a very great deal of pleasure in introducing to the House a very distinguished visitor to Canada.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have two visitors here today, one of whom will be introduced by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the other by myself.

My purpose in asking for this change in the order of business is that the hon. Lieutenant-Governor awaits our distinguished visitor and I would like, therefore, to introduce him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have with us today, the hon. François Lacoste, the Ambassador of France to Canada. He is visiting our city today, the capital of Ontario, in company with the French consul located here in Toronto.

His Excellency has recently arrived in Canada. I think he has been here only for some 6 weeks, but he is very familiar with Canada and the United States, having travelled very widely here. His mastery of our language makes listening to him very pleasant indeed and, being so completely bilingual, he puts some of the rest of us to shame.

I wish I had the ability to speak his language with the same fluency that he speaks ours. I am sure that applies to most of the hon. members in this Assembly, as I may tell His Excellency that we have in this House a number of hon. members who not only represent largely French-Canadian constituencies, but who themselves come from that great race which is one of the partnership races of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat this to him—although it is not necessary, because he is very familiar with the history of Canada, and indeed with the history of the United States, and is perhaps more widely travelled in our country and the country to the south of us than are most people.

It is a very great pleasure to have him here as the guest of our province. There are many of us here who were in his

great country, notably in the First World War, and then there are many in this Assembly who were there in the Second World War.

France is indelibly connected with the history of Canada. One of our great provinces is largely peopled by one of the great races represented here in Canada, the French race, which has made such a great and vital contribution, not only to Canada, but to America and to the world.

In our country we have no racial discrimination. It is a matter of great pride for us that the French people preserve their old traditions and language, and indeed, we are endeavouring to cultivate in Canada the retention of some of the cultures and languages and traditions which come from the people who played such an important part in establishing this great new country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it is with very great pleasure I introduce His Excellency, and to ask the hon. François Lacoste, who is a resident of southern France, coming not far from the Pyrenees, to rise and bow to this Assembly. We are indeed very glad to have him here.

MR. SPEAKER: It gives me a very great deal of pleasure to welcome to our Assembly this afternoon, a very distinguished member of the British House of Commons at Westminster, in the person of Mr. Bernard Braine, the hon. member for the riding of South East Essex.

We have many very strong ties with the old land, and we are always glad to have visitors from the Mother of Parliaments. I welcome him here on behalf of our Legislature.

I should like also to welcome to the Assembly this afternoon the students from Mountain View School, Saltfleet Township; Orchard Heights School, Applewood Acres; and Milton Public School. May I say about Milton Public School that students have been coming from that school to this House every year for the past 20 years.

The House will now revert to the introduction of Bills.

## THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

Hon. F. S. Thomas moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, like the others, will go to the Committee on Agriculture. There are a few minor amendments designed to bring the original Act up to date. The two principal amendments deal with junior exhibitors who may become members of an agricultural society, but who shall not have voting powers, when they are under 18 years of age. The other amendment reduces the age for junior directors from 30 years to 26 years. The election of directors will be by regulation under a provision of this Bill.

So far as I know, this government is the first to introduce capital grants for Class "C" fairs. The Ottawa government and our government have given grants to Classes "A" and "B" fairs. Out of 250 agricultural societies in Ontario at the present time, there are 7 which qualify for Class "A"; 33 which qualify for Class "B"; and 210 which qualify for Class "C". We propose, in connection with what we have already done in Classes "A" and "B" by way of maximum grants and regulations, to provide that Class "C" shall receive capital grants not exceeding 25 per cent. of the capital expenditure and not exceeding the sum of \$25,000.

## THE BRUCELLOSIS CONTROL ACT, 1953

Hon. Mr. Thomas moves first reading of Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend The Brucellosis Control Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion—and I think in the opinion of many rural hon. members—this proposed Bill is one of the most important features

of agricultural legislation introduced into this House. There are 3 main features which I wish to point out at the moment.

First, the Bill provides for provincial administration under a "supervised area" system.

Secondly, vaccinations and blood tests will be made without cost to the cattle owners of the Province of Ontario.

Thirdly, cattle owners will be compensated if a calf dies as a result of vaccination.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working closely with the federal Health of Animals Branch in Ottawa, and we hope they will soon be able to announce a policy which we hope and which we have requested may be somewhat similar to the tuberculosis programme—in other words, slaughter and compensation. The chief factor is that in two states of the United States, it is impossible to send in cattle unless they are free of brucellosis or Bang's disease. By 1960 or 1961, we expect the United States of America will not allow any of our cattle into that country unless they are brucellosis-free.

Mr. Speaker, therefore I have pleasure in introducing this Bill, which will be sent to the Committee on Agriculture.

## THE HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act, 1955."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have a short explanation to make of these amendments:

Section 1: subsection 2 of section 15 of The Homes for the Aged Act, 1955, is redrafted for purpose of clarification. Also, the maximum for which the province is responsible where a person is placed in special-home care is increased

from \$30 to \$32.50 monthly, making a total of \$65 available.

Sections 2 and 3: after March 31, 1957, the payments mentioned are to be made out of moneys voted separately by the Legislature. Until that date payments will be out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

### THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1956

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of Bill intituled, "The Charitable Institutions Act, 1956."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This is a general revision of the present Act which was last revised in 1931.

The following major changes in principle have been made:

1. A distinction is made between charitable organizations and charitable institutions and the method of approving them for purposes of the Act is simplified and clarified.

2. The \$2,000 per bed grant now given for new construction will be replaced by a \$2,500 per bed grant or a grant equal to 50 per cent. of the cost of the new construction, whichever is the lesser.

3. A new grant will be given to assist organizations in the purchase of approved existing buildings at the rate of \$750 per bed or 50 per cent. of the purchase price, whichever is the lesser.

4. The present grant of 20 cents a day per inmate for operation and maintenance will be replaced by a grant of \$8 per month for each person resident in the institution.

### THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

Hon W. K. Warrender moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in subsection 1 of section 1, these amendments are designed to clarify the existing expropriation powers of the commission.

Subsection 2, section 24 of The Power Commission Act sets out a number of general powers that the commission may exercise if the exercise of the power is authorized by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Subsection 2 is an amendment required in connection with the frequency standardization programme of the commission and will permit the commission to convert, with their consent, works wherever situate of persons supplying power to or purchasing power from the commission.

Section 3, subsection 1 is also in order to clarify the procedures in connection with the taking of lands for transmission line purposes.

Section 4: the scope of the provision here is extended in order to give the commission clear authority over all rates, charges and the like chargeable by municipal corporations and others receiving power from the commission.

Section 5: here there is a deletion of clauses *a*, *b* and *c*, and will enable the commission to direct the application and disposal of surplus funds in the hands of the municipalities or municipal commissions from hydro operations in such manner as the commission considers appropriate. The clauses repealed are unduly restrictive.

### THE NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1951

Hon. Mr. Warrender moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Niagara Development Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the proposed amendment contains a definition of "works" and brings it into line with the definition of "works" in The Power Commission Act.



Under section 2, these amendments clarify the commission's powers when expropriating land and bring the provision into line with the corresponding provision in The Power Commission Act.

### THE ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1952 (No. 2)

Hon. Mr. Warrender moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The St. Lawrence Development Act, 1952 (No. 2)."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, here again in section 1, there are certain definitions which are brought into line with The Power Commission Act.

Section 2: under the present law, no application can be made to the board by anyone for settlement of compensation of these cases until the owner has filed particulars of his claim. Thus it is possible for an owner to tie up proceedings indefinitely.

This amendment will enable the commission to apply to the Ontario Municipal Board for settlement of compensation whether or not the particulars of the claim have been received from the owner of the property taken or injuriously affected.

Section 3: this amendment will afford the commission under this Act the same protection it now has under The Power Commission Act.

Section 4 is a new section dealing with special problems in connection with cemeteries which will arise through the flooding of cemetery lands by the St. Lawrence Development.

I should enlarge upon the last section and say that there are 14 cemeteries in the area which will be submerged when the time comes to raise the water level there for our power development.

In this section there are certain safeguards for the people of that area concerning the removal of the bodies if they wish, and the removal of headstones.

Notices will be inserted in the papers to give proper notice to all persons interested in what is proposed, and the fact that these bodies and the headstones, if so desired, will be moved at our expense. There are other provisions which empower us to do these things.

It has come to our attention that 80 per cent. of the people in that area have indicated they do not wish the bodies removed; however, this notice will bring it to their attention, and then we will deal with them according to their wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day I wish to draw to the attention of the House the alarming number of fatalities which have occurred at railway crossings in the Province of Ontario.

In the month of November last, the first month of the present safety drive—which has been named "Operation Live"—9 persons were killed as a result of 6 level crossing accidents. In December, 13 persons were killed as a result of 9 level crossing accidents, and in January of this year, there were 3 level crossing accidents, resulting in 4 deaths.

In the first 22 days of the month of February there have been 5 level crossing accidents resulting in the deaths of 11 people. I am asking that there be read into *Hansard* a statement showing the dates and locations of these level crossing accidents in order that all who read may see where they have occurred.

I would say that 36 have died at level crossings in this period of about 3½ months. It seems to me that is at least 30 too many.

I draw this matter to the attention of the House in the hope that the Board of Transport Commissioners will examine into this situation immediately, and also accidents at level crossings and, if at all possible, find some solution which will at least reduce, if not eliminate, these most regrettable occurrences.

RAILWAY CROSSING FATALITIES  
FROM NOVEMBER 1, 1955 TO  
DECEMBER 31, 1955

| <i>Date and place</i>  | <i>No. killed</i> |
|--|-------------------|
| <i>November 5</i>  |                   |
| 5th concession of Thurlow Township<br>.7 miles west of Honeywell Corners on<br>Highway No. 37, County of Hastings,<br>CNR Crossing .....     | 3                 |
| <i>November 10</i>   |                   |
| Saltfleet, No. 50 side road, County of<br>Wentworth, CNR Crossing .....  | 3                 |
| <i>November 16</i>   |                   |
| Earlton Village, No. 11 Highway, Dis-<br>trict of Timiskaming, CNR Crossing .....  | 1                 |
| <i>November 16</i>   |                   |
| Windsor, Tecumseh Road East, Essex<br>Terminal Railway Tracks, County of<br>Essex .....  | 1                 |
| <i>November 25</i>   |                   |
| Scarborough Township, St. Clair, west<br>of Midland Ave., CNR Crossing .....   | 1                 |
| <i>December 9</i>  |                   |
| Murillo, Oliver Township, Thunder Bay<br>District, CPR Crossing .....  | 1                 |
| <i>December 19</i>   |                   |
| Pembroke, Force Road, CNR Crossing .....   | 1                 |
| <i>December 21</i>   |                   |
| Penetang, Robert Street, CNR Crossing,<br>County of Simcoe .....   | 1                 |
| <i>December 23</i>   |                   |
| Township Road, Round Lake, 4/10ths<br>of a mile north of Highway No. 60 in<br>Renfrew County, CNR Crossing .....                             | 1                 |
| <i>December 25</i>   |                   |
| Steeles Avenue, 1¼ miles east of<br>Willowdale, County of York, CNR<br>Crossing .....  | 4                 |
| <i>December 27</i>   |                   |
| County Road No. 3, 2.2 miles north<br>of Inkerman, County of Dundas, CPR<br>Crossing .....   | 2                 |
| <i>December 28</i>   |                   |
| Township Road, Petawawa Township,<br>3rd Concession, 6 miles west of Pump-<br>house Lane, Pembroke, in Renfrew<br>County, CPR Crossing ..... | 1                 |
| <i>December 30</i>   |                   |
| King's Highway No. 73, Michigan<br>Central Railroad Crossing, County of<br>Elgin .....   | 1                 |
| <i>December 31</i>   |                   |
| Rawden Township, 5.3 miles southwest<br>of Marmora, CNR Crossing .....   | 1                 |

RAILWAY CROSSING FATALITIES  
FROM JANUARY—FEBRUARY  
TO DATE, 1956

| <i>Date and place</i>  | <i>No. killed</i> |
|--|-------------------|
| <i>January 10</i>  |                   |
| Red Rock—Ghost River, (semi-private<br>road) .....   | 2                 |
| <i>January 23</i>  |                   |
| Islington Avenue North, south of No.<br>401 Highway, Township of Etobicoke .....   | 1                 |
| <i>January 26</i>  |                   |
| Private Crossing, 250 yards west of<br>Baker Road, Bertie Township, Welland<br>County .....  | 1                 |
| <i>February 1</i>  |                   |
| 3rd Concession, Amabel Township,<br>.9 miles west of No. 6 Highway, County<br>of Bruce, CNR Crossing .....                                   | 1                 |
| <i>February 10</i>   |                   |
| County Road, No. 29, .5 miles south of<br>Dresden, Kent County, C & O R.R.<br>Crossing .....   | 1                 |
| <i>February 18</i>   |                   |
| Township of Scarborough .....  | 2                 |
| <i>February 21 and 22</i>  |                   |
| There were two accidents on railway<br>crossings, 9 miles apart in Russell<br>County on which no reports have been<br>submitted as yet ..... | 3<br>3            |

I would also like to read into *Hansard* a short table which shows that for this 3-month period, November, December and January, on highways under the supervision of the Ontario Provincial Police, there have been 6,910 reportable motor-vehicle accidents. There have been 231,709 vehicles checked, which works out to approximately 2,500 vehicles every day. Warnings issued total 51,761, and charges laid total 36,338.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE  
NOVEMBER, DECEMBER, 1955, AND  
JANUARY, 1956

Relating to roads under supervision of  
The Ontario Provincial Police:

| <i>Month</i> | <i>Motor<br/>vehicle<br/>accidents</i> | <i>Vehicles<br/>checked</i> | <i>Warnings<br/>issued</i> | <i>Charges<br/>laid</i> |
|--------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1955         |  |                             |                            |                         |
| Nov.         | 2,434                                  | 96,283                      | 13,616                     | 13,552                  |
| Dec.         | 2,635                                  | 62,568                      | 16,741                     | 11,513                  |
| 1956         |  |                             |                            |                         |
| Jan.         | 1,841                                  | 72,858                      | 21,404                     | 11,273                  |
|              | <u>6,910</u>                           | <u>231,709</u>              | <u>51,761</u>              | <u>36,338</u>           |

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the day I should like to bring to the attention of the House a matter of great importance, which underlines, in a very large way, the problem of development with which we are placed.

I have mentioned to the House on various occasions the large amounts which are required, and which will be required for public investment. I mentioned it the other day in connection with the pipe line matter, stating that I did not want this amount spread any thinner than was possible, because of the enormous commitments with which we are faced.

Doctor Hearn of the Hydro advised me today that Ontario Hydro finds it necessary to speed up its planned power programme to meet the rapid expansion in the northwestern part of Ontario. I had thought all that difficulty was over for almost a generation, when we built the peak plants on the Nipigon River and elsewhere. This step will increase the resources of the northwestern division by 31,500 kilowatts.

Since the departure from this House of the former member for Grenville-Dundas (Hon. Mr. Challies), I do not know what a "kilowatt" is, but I understand that 31,500 kilowatts would be something on the order of a little better than 40,000 horsepower, which seems to be an expression I understand better than "kilowatt."

That is, by the summer of 1958.

The commission has announced that, so far this year, demands have been approximately 25 per cent. higher than during the same period in 1955. It is an amazing thing that in that area today we are using a quarter more power than we used 365 days ago.

The commissioners already had under way plants at Manitou Falls, on the English River, and at Whitedog Falls, on the Winnipeg River, to meet the anticipated load growth in that area. However, the expansion of this section of the province is increasing so rapidly that it was necessary to step up the schedule for the Whitedog Falls plant by one year. The growth is continuing

at an accelerated rate, with the result that it became immediately necessary to authorize the installation of new units at Alexander and Cameron Falls in order to meet the power demands presently indicated for 1958.

When we build the Fort Frances bridge about which the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) speaks, and a few other projects in that part of the province, I really do not know what is going to happen with power demand in that section. The new additions will increase the peak capacity of the Alexander plant by 13,500 kilowatts. I imagine that would be about 18,000 or 19,000 horsepower, and at Cameron Falls by 18,000 kilowatts, which probably would be on the order of 26,000 or 27,000 horsepower. The total estimated cost is approximately \$8 million.

That amount has to be borrowed here and in the United States. Some 20 per cent. probably will be borrowed there, and about 80 per cent. here, if we can maintain that average. That is just a part of the requirements for this "power-hungry" and in many ways "money-hungry" country, because we must have money to make the "wheels go round".

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day I should like to table answers to Questions 2, 8 and 9. I will have other answers shortly.

MR. OLIVER: I thought the hon. Prime Minister was going to go through the list of them. Are we just to have 3 today?

HON. MR. FROST: That ought to be a very good beginning. That is progress.

MR. OLIVER: Limited progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

#### THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. M. B. DYMOND (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I would like first to add my words of congratulation to you, sir, on your election to the honourable posi-



tion you now occupy, that of Mr. Speaker. I have been most impressed by your tact and tolerant impartiality and your patience with what must to you become at times most trying and tedious. And may I add that I sincerely believe you have brought to the chair an air of dignity which the honourable position richly merits.

It is frequently seen in these days that many would abandon from our lives all that has to do with the pomp and ceremony of other days; I say that if and when we bow to this clamour, we shall have greatly impoverished our cultural life.

Nations, like men, cannot live "by bread alone" and we do well to treasure and cling to all that is good and noble which has come down to us through the ages.

I want to say, in all humility, that I am most proud to stand in this House. I question if ever in my wildest dreams I felt this would happen. I may say I am more than usually proud because of the fact that I am not a Canadian born, but rather one by adoption, and it is my fervent hope that in this way I may be of some small service to this province and to this nation, in order that I may, in some measure at least, repay the tremendous debt I owe to Canada.

I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, to represent one of the new ridings in the province. It may be a new riding, but it is indeed an old part of the province, steeped in the history and traditions of Ontario. Indeed, it is the namesake of the province, Ontario County, a long county stretching from Lake Ontario at the south to Lake Couchiching's southern shore, which forms on the north the southern boundary of the great Muskoka District. A year ago my county as well as the county seat, Whitby, observed the centenary of incorporation and one stands amazed at the tremendous strides made in the span of 100 years; amazement turns to breathlessness as one contemplates the next 100, or even the next 25 years.

My riding, Mr. Speaker, is almost equally divided between urban and rural.

In the south we have the growing Town of Whitby where is already established and in operation one of the large Dunlop Rubber Company Plants.

May I say, for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Education, who alone will understand what I mean, that this is one branch of the Dunlop clan that is "no MacIntyres."

At least two other large industrial concerns are planning to locate here or in the process of building, and one needs not the vision of the seer to look to the day when Whitby will be the home of a concentration of industry comparable to that of her neighbour to the east, the great and growing City of Oshawa.

Leaving Whitby, we pass into some of the richest farm land of this great province. We have represented in the riding almost every major branch of farming. We have dairy herds known all over Canada; indeed, we have Holsteins as well worthy to be remembered by posterity as those represented by the famous statue at the eastern entrance to Woodstock in the riding of my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Innes); we have Guernseys, Ayrshires and Jerseys of note too, are to be found in Ontario riding. What beef farmer in this province has not heard of the Aberdeen Angus, the Shorthorn, the Hereford herds that are to be found in townships of Ontario County?

We have apple orchards too; the industry may not be largely represented but the quality of the product is nonetheless good and worthy of the position it takes with that of the larger operator.

In Reach Township I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, is to be found one of the largest chick hatcheries in the Dominion of Canada. Only yesterday I was informed that the quota they have already set for themselves for 1956 will make it the largest chick hatchery in this great Dominion of Canada. Here, too, is another which though not large, nonetheless is famous not only in Canada but across the seas as well. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the fame of this chick hatchery has spread as far away as Pakistan, since it was officially recog-

nized by the Government of Pakistan that the quality and this type of bird hatched in this establishment was peculiarly well suited to conditions in that country. I simply mention that, because the Rhode Island Reds of Reach Township are also very famous indeed.

Sheep and pigs, too, Mr. Speaker, are produced in quantity by our farmers and we even have a not inconsiderable acreage devoted to the production of small vegetables for the city market. I need hardly make mention of the potatoes of Scott and Uxbridge Townships, sir, since I am certain they are known far and wide. Indeed they are among the earliest domestic potatoes to make an appearance on the great food markets of this Metropolitan area.

I would be remiss indeed if I neglected to remind this House, sir, that in Ontario riding is located one of the few remaining farms devoted solely to the breeding of horses, even though they are racing stock. This is a matter of no small note since it does so much to bring Ontario riding to the attention of the people of this province and this Dominion.

But I would not leave the impression that all the farmers of my riding are specialists. Sometimes I fear we are living in an era of over-specializing. No, Mr. Speaker, I am very certain that the great majority of my farmers are ordinary folk, engaged in the ordinary business of mixed farming, and I hope to return to that topic later on.

I would repeat now that about half of the good folk, whom I have the honour to represent, are engaged in the agricultural industry; whether it be horse breeding, dairy or beef cattle, pigs, sheep, chickens, turkeys, mink, potatoes, small vegetables and even bees. And too, sir, we are most interested in this great business of tourists which means so much to our province.

Our lakes in the south and central part of the riding—Scugog, Musselmanns and Chalk Lakes—are all peculiarly situated in that they are well within commuting distance of the Metropolitan area, and so, we enjoy perhaps a longer

tourist season than some of the other lake districts.

Farther north the shores of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching, and the Severn River, attract great hosts of summer residents, and these, sir, spill over into the ridings of the hon. Prime Minister, on the east, and into the great Muskoka District on the north.

I have recounted these matters in no small detail, Mr. Speaker, to show that Ontario riding is very much concerned about all or practically all of the matters which come under the care and scrutiny of the House, because the people are vitally affected themselves.

But I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the matter for which I arose; to speak in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. I would crave your indulgence, sir, and that of this House, if I make a further personal reference in this connection.

When the hon. Prime Minister made reference to the hon. member for York South in the early days of this session, he made reference to the fact that the hon. member was a Scot and also a graduate of one of our great universities, Queens. Now, I too am a Scot by birth, and I too, have the proud honour of being a graduate of Queens, but I make this reference here, lest any hon. member should draw the inference that because one is a Scot, and a graduate of Queens, it follows he should—politically, at any rate—"go off the beam", if you will pardon my falling into the vernacular.

Ours is a great university indeed, Mr. Speaker, and it is a never-ending source of amazement to me that one should be under the spell of Queens for as long as is required, even to take even a degree in arts, without having absorbed some of her sound, solid, reasonable thinking. But ours, too, is a wise old Alma Mater, fair-minded and tolerant to a fault, which will sit quietly by, patiently waiting and fervently hoping that those of her sons and daughters who have strayed somewhat may see the error of their way in time to amend it.

I would refer to the hon. member for York South's remarks in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and would say that they might well be summed up in one line, from the pen of an unknown Scottish author—a line which I believe is well known to all who are of Scottish persuasion and will be understood by all who know anything of the Scots tongue: "They're a' oot o' step but oor Jock." There was in them the fire and zeal of the evangelist, the doleful wailing of Ecclesiastes, but there was lacking the fair-mindedness that tolerance and the sound logic of the common man.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. member read the life of John Knox, and see how tolerant he was?

MR. DYMOND: May I say to the hon. member that John Knox has passed from the scene.

And that, sir, is just why this Party, which forms the government of this province, is where it is today—because it is close to and listens to, and works for the common man. It is in very truth the "People's Party". And I also find I am at variance with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in my reading of the Speech from the Throne. He stated:

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne is a masterpiece of saying nothing. It is well worded; no question about that. But the meat in the Speech from the Throne is not there, except as to what may be guessed at in regard to its contents.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the writer of the speech was too modest, but as I read it, I am bound to think of the tremendous help provided through so many and varied grants, as, for example, those to the municipalities, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition had something to say about them. He believed they were only increased all along the line in accord with the growth of Ontario's population and economy.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to quote some statistics as they relate to my riding. I will compare

figures for the years 1943 and 1955. First for education—in 1943 we received a total of \$82,000; in 1955 this was \$959,000. For streets and roads \$101,000 in 1943; \$507,000 in 1955. For health and welfare—\$1,480 in 1943; but \$84,000 in 1955. Lastly the municipal subsidy in 1943 amounted to \$33,000 but in 1955 had reached a total of \$103,000.

Now sir, we are aware in this House—and all over the province, indeed—that the growth of Ontario's economy has been phenomenal but it has not been as great as the percentage increase of this government's aid to the municipalities. Why, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary grants for education last year in my riding were in excess of 50 per cent. of the total aid for all municipal purposes in 1943. In this regard alone, sir, I agree the Speech from the Throne left much unsaid; I repeat, it was too modest.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the hon. member for Ontario a question, for my own information?

MR. DYMOND: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member was speaking about educational grants in his riding now and in 1943, and would the hon. member say that the present grants for education going into his riding bear a larger proportion of the total grants for education than the grants in 1943?

MR. DYMOND: I will come to that.

Now, all this is to the good, but I would like to say here, that the plight of the rural and the small urban municipality is not very enviable even yet. It is argued that we receive grants for education on a much higher percentage basis than does the town and city. But I would remind you sir, of something said in this House by an hon. member a few days ago that "the division of taxing powers is entirely out of balance."



None will deny that one of the basic requirements for solid citizenship is home ownership. But home ownership implies several and variable factors. When industrial and commercial assessment get out of balance with residential assessment, the danger signals are flying. And that is what is happening in the rural and small urban centres today; we have a preponderance of residential assessment and no industrial assessment to offset it. And even because of this we are unable to do the things necessary to attract industry. Homes require all modern services; good streets, sidewalks, sewers, hydro, waterworks and schools. Only the other day, one of my reeves was much concerned because of an influx of children, sons and daughters of new Canadians, and most welcome indeed, but they are placing a heavy burden upon the existing school facilities. Perhaps the answer is federal assistance for education; I do not know.

I do know that this government here in this province today is operating on a moderate tax structure, whereas our friends at Ottawa are maintaining a wartime scale of taxation to support a peacetime economy. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is a matter of some urgency that our entire tax structure be under constant scrutiny, so that municipal taxation may be brought and kept within realistic bounds. Obviously the starting point lies within the federal-provincial sphere, and I now venture a little way into this field.

I know the grant-in-aid system is too firmly established to permit any serious thought as to abolish it, but I do suggest this, as a general, very broad, but I think sound, principle, that the spending authority should also be the taxing authority in the production of its own revenues. It would appear, therefore, necessary that the provinces continue to remind the Federal Government of the needs of the lesser governments and to urge that Ottawa gauge its programme of taxation accordingly. All around us, wherever we look we see the multitude of services and activities daily touching

the lives of all our people, which are the responsibility of the Provincial and Municipal Governments, yet nearly 80 per cent. of our tax dollar goes to the Federal Treasury.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister of this province is to be complimented for his attitude in this regard, and it is gratifying indeed to know that at his insistence there will be continual liaison and conferences between the two levels of government.

I would be untrue to my riding, Mr. Speaker, if I failed to say something about agriculture. I gathered that the hon. leader of the Opposition felt we were not very interested or concerned about this vital matter. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, my riding is almost half agricultural. Over 185,000 acres are devoted to field crops, and the value of these last year was in excess of \$6 million. The total value of livestock and poultry last year was nearly \$15 million. Let no man say we are not concerned about the problems faced by the farmer today.

It is a matter of grave concern to me that the income of the farmer has dropped 30 per cent. during the past 5 years, and it is more grave when we realize that this drop has occurred in the face of an increase in the general economy.

Here again a solution seems to elude us; it is so easy to say "the government should correct this fault", or "that fault", but no one seems to know what the fault is or where it lies.

Nor is it a problem only of our own farmers; our neighbours to the south are faced with a similar problem and they too are groping for an answer. They have called the problem "a crisis of plenty"; perhaps it is.

The farmer has often been referred to as a "rugged individualist", but unfortunately the tone used often is rather cynical or even sneering. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to this House, the farmer is a rugged individualist and he is proud of it. And I say to you and this House, that if

and when he loses his rugged individualism we will have lost something that will not easily be regained.

This I do believe, that even now in his present strait he is no beggar coming with cap in hand seeking a hand-out; he only asks the right to work out his own salvation helped by whatever means may be afforded him within the framework of the Constitution.

I am equally sure that the pronouncement of the hon. Prime Minister of Wednesday, February 15, that "this government was pledged to do that and would honour its pledge," must have been gratifying to the farmer. To have settled once and for all, or at least for the foreseeable future—lest the hon. leader of the Opposition take exception to it, may I say—the legality of The Marketing Act and then to do all possible to see that this and other similar Acts operate as they were intended, is a forward step indeed. Only this afternoon, we heard the hon. Minister of Agriculture introduce two Bills which will be of not inconsiderable value to the farmers of Ontario.

In delving into this agricultural question I came upon several things which impressed me very much. One was in the matter of the per capita consumption of our farm products. In the case of wheat and wheat products the per capita consumption today is just a little over half what it was 40 years ago.

In the case of potatoes, the same holds true. Meat, milk, eggs, cheese, fruit and vegetables have increased in per capita consumption, but only very slightly. I say this is a most surprising thing when we remember that this is one of the best fed nations in the world. Indeed, so true is this that the treatment and control of obesity is one of the great problems facing medical men on the North American continent.

And in support of that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. members just to look around this hon. House.

Perhaps herein lies a partial solution to this farm problem. A well conceived but ambitious programme of advertising farm products could, I believe, be of

inestimable value. I do not believe we smoke so much tobacco or consume the great quantities of alcoholic beverages we do because they are particularly palatable; I am certain the tremendous advertising campaigns which back up these products have much to do with the sale of these items. If it works for them why not have it work for the farmer?

I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying something about the matter of pensions and other such aids. These are all very much to the good, albeit I still fail to understand why every one should be given \$40 per month just because he or she has reached the age of 70 years—and I make clear this is my personal opinion only! For those who do not need this, and we all know there are many, it is of little value. If this money were added to the pension of those who really need help, how much more good would result. I would hope that some method may be worked out to bring the assistance given to our senior citizens and those who are in need for other reasons more into keeping with their needs. I cannot help but feel that a government which has done so much for our people will find a way to do this also.

Of hospitalization insurance I would say this. I am pleased to see this subject finally taken out of the stage of hinting and conjecture. It has often been charged that the medical profession is opposed to health or hospitalization insurance. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Indeed, sir, the Ontario Medical Association did sponsor, some years ago, a scheme of prepaid health insurance which has grown to be one of the most acceptable and successful non-profit making schemes in operation today.

If further proof were needed I quote from the *Canadian Medical Association Statement of Policies and Principles on Health Insurance in Canada, June 1955*.

The CMA approved of the adoption of the principle of contributory health insurance and favours a plan or plans which will assure the development and provision of the highest standards

of health services—preventive, curative, rehabilitative—provided the plan be fair both to the insured and all those rendering the service.

Since much, no doubt, will yet be said on this question, I will say only this, Mr. Speaker, that having taken this matter into the realm of the active, we apply ourselves with all diligence and despatch to the development of the best possible scheme; a scheme flexible enough to permit of amendment or change as time and experience may dictate, and having developed it, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust we will keep it under constant scrutiny and review to the end that it will always be the best possible scheme. In promoting this scheme, I say we have further evidence that this government is vitally concerned with a programme of human betterment and is actively doing something about it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I read a good deal more in the Speech from the Throne than did some of our hon. friends. I read in it a programme of vision, a programme of courage and a programme of sound planning—not the planning of dreamers but the sort of planning which has brought Ontario where it is today and which will guide this great province to that position of importance and influence that is her true destiny.

It is particularly fitting in my belief at least that I am permitted to speak during this week, which has been designated by the hon. Prime Minister as "Brotherhood Week". In the country from which my roots spring, we are claimed to have a very close link with this matter of the "brotherhood of man"; in fact, the national bard of Scotland, I believe, was one of the outstanding protagonists of this great and tremendous movement.

I was amazed the other day when I listened to an hon. member with a name that at least suggests he has very similar roots—the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—when out of one side of his mouth he paid "lip service" to this movement, and the next day he rose and before this House expressed

the fear that our friends to the south of us would come here and "swallow" us up. I do not think this typifies the type of "brotherhood" Bobbie Burns envisioned, when he said:

*Then let us pray that come it may,  
And come it will for a' that,  
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth  
Maun bear the gree and a' that.*

*For a' that and a' that,  
It's coming yet for a' that  
That man to man the world o'er  
Shall brithers be for a' that.*

MR. G. E. JACKSON (London South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I have observed that it is customary and proper to congratulate various members of this House. I note that you, Mr. Speaker, are singled out and congratulated on your appointment as Speaker—may I add my most sincere congratulations and good wishes. I find in the speeches of other members, who have already spoken, congratulations given to the mover and seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Although mine may be buried under the many received, I wish these two members would please accept my sincere congratulations in the manner in which they are given.

Various Ministers are congratulated and even the hon. leader of the Opposition is congratulated by the Minister of Labour. I thought in this my first speech I had better play it safe, and so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate everyone in the House, especially having just heard the speech of the hon. member for the Riding of Ontario. Everyone probably feels that he has done something for which we can be congratulated and, therefore, I wish all the members would accept my congratulations.

In this my maiden speech I feel I would be remiss if I did not tell you how pleased I am to be here and what an honour it is to be the representative for the people of London South. I do not propose to tell you what a wonderful place my riding is, but I would rather invite you to visit it in your own



time. Those of you who have been there know what a wonderful place it is and what wonderful people reside there.

The people of London South riding are most interested in certain things which were mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and I would like to bring a few of them before the House at this time.

The question of conservation and management of our resources is one of vital importance, not only to the riding of London South, but to all ridings in this province. Particularly I would like to deal today with the problem concerning conservation and management of these resources as it pertains to this riding.

We have running through London South the south branch of the Thames River. This branch has its beginning near Tavistock and is fed by a middle branch near Thamesford and eventually joins the north branch of the Thames River in the City of London, flowing on down through Chatham and into Lake St. Clair.

The problems and difficulties in controlling these two branches have been great over the past centuries. At one time floods plagued the inhabitants of the river banks and since 1792 there have been recorded 120 floods on the Thames River. I might add 64 of them were recorded in the years from 1901 to 1954. These floods caused great havoc, including loss of life.

To improve conditions throughout the Thames Valley and with a view to preventing floods mentioned previously, the Upper Thames River Valley Authority was formed, as were many other authorities, 19 in all, throughout the province. This authority has done a magnificent job to date and is working in close co-operation with The Department of Planning and Development of this government. The Fanshawe Dam, which was constructed on the north branch of the Thames, has already justified the expenditure of \$5 million in averting two floods and in providing people of London and surrounding communities with a large lake behind this dam. A

few years ago it was a partially dried up river bed, and farm land, but it is now providing summer facilities for boating, swimming and in general a large recreation area for the enjoyment of many people.

Plans have been drawn up by the Upper Thames Valley Authority to build more dams and reservoirs on the north and south branches to improve this river further.

But the problem, as you can well imagine, in a project as large as this is one of finances. In the past the Province of Ontario has assisted in financing 37½ per cent. of any given project, this amount being matched by the Federal Government to the extent of 37½ per cent. with the remaining 25 per cent. being obtained from communities which surround the proposed project.

Recently, the various authorities throughout Ontario were told that the Federal Government will not give any aid to any project under \$5 million. The plans of the Upper Thames Valley Authority, in order to carry out their whole scheme, amount to projects over \$9 million. The question is whether or not the Federal Government will allow them to group these projects together so as to allow them to carry out their original plan, which was the prevention and control of floods on the Thames River. A delegation went to Ottawa in January, 1955, to ask if they could expect the usual aid in order to carry out their over-all plans. To date the Thames Valley Authority—and, I assume, other authorities—are still waiting for a reply from Ottawa as to what help they can expect. I say it is time they were told. I think over a year is long enough to wait and it makes me feel that the Federal Government are pulling that old army trick, which may be familiar to hon. members.

The Department of Planning and Development for Ontario has already given some encouragement to the conservation authorities, in that if the Federal Government refuses to look at the Thames Valley Authority plans as one scheme, but prefers to look at them as a series of individual projects, this

department will increase its aid from 37½ per cent. to 50 per cent. of the project, thus showing to the authority that this government is behind their plan and recognizes its importance.

I feel sure that if the Federal Government does not give the necessary aid, the 19 authorities in the province who are presently engaged in conservation will not only be curtailed, but will be forced to abandon their plans. How any responsible government can continue to hedge in such a vital issue is something I cannot understand.

With an eye to the future in increasing the population through immigration, the question of conservation becomes vitally important and I would say to the federal Minister responsible that if he has any feeling towards the people of southwestern Ontario, through which this Thames River runs, let him give them his answer now and let it be a promise of continued aid.

In these plans that I have mentioned, which are presently being considered by the Upper Thames Valley Authority and The Department of Planning and Development, I would like them to consider one thing. That is the condition of the south branch of the Thames River, which runs right through my riding. This branch at present is in a very deplorable condition, especially in the summer months when the summer flow drops to a mere trickle and the smells of pollution do nothing to improve the summer air. I would suggest to these two bodies that the condition of this branch calls for immediate action, and although the plans of placing reservoirs on the river are not scheduled for some years yet, I would suggest that these plans be altered and that reservoirs be started now and an anti-pollution campaign be lodged at once.

The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Elliott) has already suggested this use of our anti-pollution laws and I heartily concur. Reservoirs will increase the summer flow of this river, and industry which is presently polluting the river should be forced to abide by our anti-pollution laws. These industries are known to the authority and steps should

be taken immediately to have them clean up their problem of waste and sewage disposal. I sincerely hope the Bill introduced today will do much to correct this vital problem.

The second matter I would like to bring before the House is the matter of parks, especially in built up areas of municipalities. In the riding of London South there is an Ontario Teachers' College, which is about to be moved from its present location to the vicinity of the campus of the University of Western Ontario. This would leave the present building and campus of the Ontario Teachers' College vacant and available for another use.

May I urgently suggest that this land be turned over to the City of London, either free or at a modest sum, to be used by the citizens of London as park land and thus give the people in this large and built up area in London a park to enjoy. The land, comprising one square block of city property, is highly suitable for this purpose. People presently living in apartment houses, especially children, need park areas and here is an opportunity for this government to give them such an area. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Education to consider this matter seriously.

It might interest the House to know that a private citizen has already approached me, promising a very substantial amount of money to be given to the city if the Minister of Public Works deems it necessary to charge them for this property. Here indeed is a generous gift from one individual and a gift which should be used.

In closing, may I commend the Minister of Education and his associates in the department for the interest they are taking, in giving help and aid to the vital problem of retarded children. This is a very worthwhile project and speaks highly of any government that takes active steps in facing the problem. I trust consideration will be given by the hon. Minister to increase aid to the schools that are presently established to look after these children. It has been

proven now that these children themselves do derive great benefits from attending schools of this nature and the parents find great relief and peace of mind.

Before closing, I would like to commend the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) in his remarks concerning White's Bush. I have the same feelings regarding taking areas such as White's Bush, setting them up as parks and places of beauty which everyone can enjoy.

While the few things that I have spoken about this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, may appear to be on a local level, I am sure that many members in the House this afternoon have similar problems, and I sincerely hope that before this session ends I can report to the people of my riding that steps have been taken and progress is being made in these vital matters.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to speak on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Like all the new members, I feel pride and humility, and some concern on this first opportunity to formally address this honoured Legislature.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey to you my personal congratulations. I have been much impressed by your dignity and your impartiality. While I have not known you for a long period of time, the demonstration you have given us thus far in the House is the reason why so much confidence was placed in your person, and you were elevated to your present position.

I would also at the outset, like to convey my personal congratulations to the hon. leader of my Party (Mr. Oliver). I have not known the hon. leader of the Opposition for a great length of time, but in the time I have known him I have learned to regard him as a public servant of great value, one who has given much of his time and ability to good government in this province.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: He is like old wine, he improves with age.

MR. WINTERMEYER: His humility and his honesty are patterns for all of us, and his ability to express himself forcefully and effectively is well known to every hon. member of this House. What might be of personal interest to you, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition has taken a keen interest in assisting the newly-elected hon. members in the Liberal Party.

I think that is of particular interest to you, Mr. Speaker, and of concern to the hon. members of this House, because in the development of the Opposition members, we have an important and integral part of good government to play in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to convey my respects to the hon. Prime Minister. Naturally, I have not known nor been associated with him but I have learned to respect him for the detailed explanations that he has given to this House, for his constant attention to, and his knowledge of all matters which pertain to the activities of this House. I have been particularly impressed by the fact that he is prepared to acknowledge the position which the Opposition must play, and he has not handicapped the opportunity the Opposition members have sought to express, at appropriate times, criticisms of the government. For this I congratulate him.

With respect to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald); like most hon. members of this House, I am required to judge the hon. member from his activities in the House thus far. I do not agree with everything the hon. member has said or done, and with certain of his conclusions I would be in serious conflict. Perhaps, as a lawyer, I would be inclined to the opinion his conclusions do not justify the premises upon which they have been drawn. But, Mr. Speaker, I would draw to the attention of the House, something which has impressed me, and that is the hon. member's courage and willingness to stand



before this House and express his opinions forcibly.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that on this occasion each hon. member has an opportunity to draw to the attention of the House some of the concerns and some of the problems which his constituents have discussed with him. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that my area is industrial. Basically, it is a manufacturing area. In part, however, it is devoted to the agricultural industry.

It started from very humble beginnings approximately 150 years ago. The first settlers were of Pennsylvania Dutch extraction. Subsequently, peoples from Germany and central European states were attracted in large numbers, and, of course, in addition it is represented by a large number of English citizenry. As a result, we have today a cosmopolitan population representative of most of the dominant races in the world, and I think our area is demonstrative of Canadianism in action.

I said at the outset that ours was primarily an industrial area. I would draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that within my riding there are approximately 23,000 people engaged directly in manufacturing, and there are upwards of 300 separate manufacturing units in that area. I think in this respect my riding is unique in Ontario and perhaps in all Canada.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things which the people of my riding want and expect. Some of these are within the competence of this House, and others are not. Briefly, with respect to those things that are within the competence of this House, I would refer firstly to the matter of highways.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members are quite familiar with the fact that in due course Highway No. 401 will pass within approximately 15 or 20 miles of my area. The difficulty of the people of my area, and which they have expressed to me, is the fact that we do not have a good highway from our highly-industrialized area to join with Highway No. 401. It is my understanding that the

existing highway facility to a very highly industrialized and busy urban area is to be developed in the near future, and will join Highway No. 401.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, to the government and to the hon. members of government responsible for highways, that immediate steps be taken to determine whether or not it would not be much better to forget about the existing highway, which leads from Kitchener to Highway No. 401, and develop in its stead a new non-access highway, because it will be foolhardy if, in the future, we find that in our desire to speed traffic through the province, it will take, for example, three-quarters of an hour to travel from Kitchener to Galt, and then approximately the same time thereafter on Highway No. 401 to Toronto.

In other words, if we are going to use our system of highways, as we have it at the present time, to form a junction with Highway No. 401, we are, in my opinion, going to spend money foolishly and ineffectively, and I am sure in a manner which can be criticized by all.

I draw this to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, not in a petty or political manner, but with the sincere hope that hon. members of government will give this matter immediate attention, because it is my understanding that the so-called "connecting link" will be developed within the next few months.

The second matter of local concern which I would draw to your attention is that of water resources. We have had the privilege this afternoon of hearing the hon. Prime Minister say that the Bill he introduced will provide the nucleus or basis upon which a vast water-resources system can be provided for southwestern Ontario. That is of great interest to the people of my area, particularly because of the industrialization.

It is understandable, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot ask for, nor promote, industrial developments without a real assurance that we can give to the prospective industries adequate supplies of water, and the statement by the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon adds real

confidence to our hopes and expectations that the time will come when we in the hinterland section of southwestern Ontario will have the same adequate supply of water as the cities and communities immediately adjoining the Great Lakes.

I cannot leave this particular subject without commenting on the suggested chairman of this commission, namely Mr. A. M. Snyder. It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Snyder for an extended period of time. He is a very honoured, experienced, and good business executive. He is the head of a large business organization in my riding, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that his appointment will be accepted wholeheartedly, and with enthusiasm, and in him we will have a man of courage and ability to carry on this particular programme.

I would like now for a few moments to refer to a few points which are of wide interest. The first to which I would like to make reference is the matter of labour relations. I am encouraged to make these comments by the fact that a few days ago the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) suggested that criticism of the labour relations policy is a desirable and a good thing. He said in this particular field we are in a realm of human problems which are difficult and debatable.

I was also very much encouraged in my discussions on this problem by the comments of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay), yesterday, and I agree wholeheartedly with his observations. I thought the hon. member spoke very eloquently and wisely in respect to this particular problem, and much of what he said I had intended to refer to at this particular time. However, I will try to tailor my remarks with respect to labour relations to the comments which have already been made, but perhaps be more specific.

The problem I have in mind is in regard to conciliation and, at the outset, I would say that I agree with the hon. member for Riverdale when he said we have no desire to change the Act. I do not think anybody who has had real

experience in the labour-relations field would suggest that we effect any fundamental changes in the legislative enactments regarding labour relations. I think, however, where suggested criticisms could be brought to bear is in the matter of the enforcement of the Act.

To be more specific—and again, as I say, with respect to conciliation—let me simply point out that under existing legislation, parties must attempt to solve their respective problems for a period of 35 days before conciliation can be brought into the picture; after they have so attempted to solve their problems, a request is made to The Department of Labour for conciliation facilities, and, as has been said, a conciliation officer is then appointed. He immediately investigates and reports back to the hon. Minister of Labour. This must be within a period of 14 days.

If he cannot settle the matter, he reports to the hon. Minister, and then either of the disputants, that is, management or labour, can immediately ask for a board of conciliation. Upon this request being received, two members are appointed within a period of 5 days—I believe it is—and within a period of 3 days thereafter a chairman is appointed.

Subsequently, it is the intention, as set forth in the Act, that within a period of 14 days, the board report its findings. Therefore, it is the intention under the administration of the Act that within a period of 35 days, if the parties have demonstrated their inability to solve their problem as between themselves, the conciliation mechanism comes into the picture. However, Mr. Speaker, my challenge is this; in very, very few instances is the conciliation procedure completed within the allotted 35 days.

My personal experience has been that the Act has been disregarded more by its exceptions than by its adherence to the policy suggested in the Act. I have confidence in the statement that much of the difficulty regarding labour relations is caused by the human element, and when parties are at loggerheads, and an attempt is being made to settle something, it is most desirable that their

problem be settled as quickly as possible. If they are not, little things will subsequently appear during any delays, and minor problems will become exaggerated, and very often develop to a point where something which was not important at the outset suddenly becomes very important, and as a result of delays the parties reach an insoluble position, whereas, at the outset, they had, perhaps, no idea that their problems would be insoluble.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my first observation with respect to the enforcement of the Act is a suggestion to government that it insist on a strict adherence to the Act. As I have said, I do not criticize the Act, but I do suggest that the failure to adhere to the strict limitations provided for conciliation procedure, has been a source of real difficulty.

The second observation, Mr. Speaker, I want to make—and it is made with deference, as a lawyer—is the suggestion that in many cases judges have been appointed as conciliation board chairmen. I say this with deference, and I hope I will not be misunderstood, but I do not think that judges are ideal conciliation board chairmen. I think they are excellent chairmen of arbitration boards, as their duties tend to adjudication, with which they are familiar, but I do not think they are particularly familiar with prior experienced in the matter of conciliation.

So that I will not be misunderstood, may I say it is my opinion that the basic purpose of a board of conciliation is to try and bring together two disputing parties. It is true that evidence is given to this board; it is true the board will make a finding. But it is also true that the board's decision will not be final in the manner we normally expect of a judge's decision.

Therefore, I would suggest to those responsible for the administration of this Act that they seriously consider the advisability of building up, within the Province of Ontario, people who will be experienced with conciliation procedure. I do not think these people should be

government people, and in this respect I differ from the hon. member for Riverdale, who suggested, I believe, that conciliation be changed to a point where the conciliation officer, a government man, becomes chairman of a board.

I do not think that is wise, because it is going to put the government in a position where it must agree either with one side or the other, it must support labour or it must support management, and I do not think the government should be put in that position. I think the chairman should be impartial and separated entirely from the government.

There are people in the province today who are experienced and capable in this field, for example, Mr. Eric Taylor, and there are others whose abilities could be developed.

The hon. member for Riverdale yesterday suggested that by means of education and university courses, additional personnel could be developed. I agree with him in that particular aspect. However, I think an effort should be made to build up within this province a group of persons who will be highly skilled, and acceptable to both management and labour, who can handle all the technicalities involved, who will be available to sit on conciliation boards, and who will be ready at a moment's notice.

In this respect, as hon. members know, judges are busy men, and very often if they get a request to act on a conciliation board, they look at their calendars and find they will not be able to sit on conciliation for a period of a month or 6 weeks, as a result of which the whole process is delayed until the opportunity is afforded that particular judge to meet his particular personal schedule. I do not think that is a desirable thing.

As I said at the outset, I agree absolutely with the comments which were made yesterday by the hon. member for Riverdale, and I think they were made very eloquently, and I do not want to suggest in anything I am saying that I differ with him, except in this



one respect, regarding conciliation by government officials: I do not think that is a desirable thing. I think anything government can do to speed up conciliation processes, and to assure that they are proceeded with as expeditiously as possible, will be of material advantage in the settlement of many of our labour-relations problems.

I do not think I can emphasize this problem too much, Mr. Speaker, because it is my frank opinion this problem is going to become a very serious one, as time goes on. It is within the realm of this government that we are going to have to exercise the type of leadership and ingenuity, to which the hon. Prime Minister has frequently referred. In effect, he said "we should look to the future and be prepared to meet the problems of the future," and I agree with him.

Among the problems, as anyone can see, is the question of automation and the question of a guaranteed annual wage. These are real problems, and will require foresight in their solution.

For instance, in regard to a guaranteed annual wage, I recognize the inherent difficulties of a man conducting a business guaranteeing to his employees an annual wage, but if we are worth our salt, if we are worthy of being legislators, and if we are prepared to think in terms of the future and exercise the ingenuity with which we have been endowed, then I think we can find a solution to this problem, which will be of real economic value, to the extent that it will assure a steady buying power in the hands and control of a large proportion of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much time because it will be my privilege to speak again on the occasion of the Budget Debate. However, there is one more problem to which I would like to refer, and which has some universal application, and that is the matter of education.

I am not going to speak with respect to elementary or secondary education, but I am particularly concerned with the matter of university bursaries, and

with your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read some of the information I have assembled in the last few days. I would like to say for the record that my authorities are the following: the *Institute of International Education News Bulletin* for January, 1955; the *National Federation of Canada University Student Brief* dated December, 1955, and an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled, "The Crises of the Classes," as published by the University of Toronto, on December 13 and 14, 1955. This is the information I would like to present for your consideration.

At the present time in England, 70 per cent. of the university students are receiving state financial aid toward the cost of their personal education. In Canada, at the present time, 14 per cent. of the students are receiving such aid.

That is a terrific disparity, that 70 out of every 100 students in England are receiving assistance, while in Canada only 14 out of every 100 are receiving similar assistance.

MR. KERR: How many are there?

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am speaking percentage-wise, not in numbers at all. I do not think numbers enter into it. What I am suggesting to you for your consideration is at the present time, 70 per cent. of all the English university students are receiving assistance from the government, whereas in Canada, it is only 14 per cent.

MR. KERR: But if you have 70 per cent.—

MR. WINTERMEYER: I think there are far more in the English universities.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am sorry I do not have the reference available to mention the number at the present time. However, I will be glad to get it, and table it, and I am sure it will verify the statement I have just made.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, at the present time in England, 50 per cent. of all the

students in all the universities are from very low income families. In Canada, I do not have any specific, nor direct comparison, but I do have this information, that in the course of the last 25 years, our rural university population—that is, boys and girls from rural areas—has fallen from 27 per cent. of the total enrolment to 7 per cent.

In other words, there are not as many rural students in universities as there were 25 years ago and our students in the low-income class have likewise fallen from 21 per cent. to 12 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that due to the cost of living, boys and girls who are desirous, and who have the ability to pursue university courses, are finding it more and more difficult.

I think that is very important because if we are to look to the future, and expect from university graduates the leadership and the knowledge of our sciences which has been suggested several times in this House, then I say we have to do something about this problem, and provide university bursaries for worthy students, in a more worthwhile manner than we have up to the present time.

I realize that the hon. Prime Minister has told us on many occasions that we are necessarily curtailed by the constant demand for money on all sides, but if it is for the future we are looking to these people then I suggest one of our aims should certainly be that no boy or girl with ability, and who has the academic standing to pursue a university course, should be denied it simply because of personal financial difficulties.

We have had some wonderful demonstrations of private foundations doing an admirable job in this respect, and while I do not believe in criticizing just for the sake of criticizing, I would suggest to those hon. members in this House who are responsible for the administration, that they consider the advisability of forming co-operative or joint ventures with industry and business, and I think industry and business can be encouraged to put far more money into

endowments than they do at the present time.

It was Doctor Smith, president of the University of Toronto, who recently said a fantastically small portion of the total tax-exempt money which industry is permitted is used at the present time. If industry can be encouraged in this venture—and I suggest that they can be—and if we give them some degree of encouragement and leadership, then I think we can build, within this province, sufficient endowment funds to provide the help and assistance which I suggest is vitally needed at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if I might revert to one or two personal matters, I would like to say that I think it is important we all recognize the problem with which the Opposition members are faced. It is understandable that we do not have the technical assistance and the knowledge and the background which are available to the government members, and necessarily our criticisms—and I hope they are constructive—must be of a trial-and-error nature. We have to probe; we have to try hard in the hope that we will hit upon something that is justifiable. I hope hon. members opposite will understand that ours is not one solely of questioning anything that comes up just for the sake of doing so, but rather to question in order to determine if there is, or can be, any substance to our criticism.

I trust hon. members opposite will appreciate this problem and will assist us. I have been much encouraged by the hon. leaders of the government in the manner in which they have invited criticism, and the time they have allotted to members of the Opposition to express themselves. I say this, simply so all will understand the limitations which we have, and the desire we have to do a job that is inherent in democratic government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted another personal reference, I want to mention something which has impressed me very much since I have been in this House. Older members are

probably no longer so impressed, but I cannot tell you of the thrill of real confidence that I got in good government, when I came into this House and noted that each day the proceedings are opened with prayers, and that on each occasion we, in effect, acknowledge our submission to Almighty God. We are saying, in effect, it is our basic purpose to carry out His will.

After all, it is one thing to talk about building good roads and schools and all the other things, but it is another thing to recognize our fundamental dependence on God, and the fact that our fundamental purpose is to carry out His will in respect to the administration of law. Certainly it is an honoured trust we have, to enact laws for the people of Ontario, and I think the demonstration of our conviction that we are sincere in our purpose is emphasized by the fact each afternoon prayers are read at the commencement of our sittings.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I do not intend to speak at any great length because it will be my privilege to speak again in the debate on the Budget, therefore, I will simply conclude by saying that it has been a pleasure to address this hon. Assembly this afternoon, and to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity.

HON. W. K. WARRENDER (Minister Without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me, at this time, to present my first report to hon. members of this Legislative Assembly, having been in office in Hydro now since August 17, 1955.

Fifty years ago this year, hon. members of this House assembled to pass unanimously what has come to be regarded as one of the most important pieces of legislation ever presented in this province. A Conservative Government, under James Pliny Whitney, had been elected on a platform that included public ownership of the water resources of this province to be used for the generation of electric power. The Opposition was also in agreement on this *then* revolutionary principle. The people of

Ontario had spoken, and this House had listened.

On April 11, 1906, an extraordinary scene took place within these walls. Some 1,500 persons representing Ontario municipalities interested in the municipal control of power, who had previously met at Toronto's City Hall, crowded into this building to present to the House a resolution passed at their earlier meeting. In the light of what has happened since, that resolution, an expression of the people's will, is of interest today. It read as follows:

That the municipalities now present and represented in the City Hall, Toronto, having an urban and rural population of over one million, respectfully urge upon the Governor-in-Council of the Province of Ontario the necessity of safeguarding the people's interests by originating, as a government measure, legislation enabling the Governor-in-Council to appoint a permanent provincial commission with power to take, where considered by it advisable, the following action:

The construction, purchase or expropriation of works for the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical power and light; to arrange with any existing development company or companies for power at a reasonable price, so as to be *transmitted and sold by the government* to municipalities or others; also to vest in it the powers necessary to enable it to regulate the price at which electricity shall be sold to all and every consumer, whether municipal, corporate or private.

Back of this great movement for public ownership of power were men like Adam Beck, D. B. Detweiler and E. W. B. Snyder, whose grandson you have listened to today.

The latter, who sat in this House as a member, was chairman in 1903, of what was known as "The Ontario Power Commission," an organization set up by 7 municipalities—Toronto, London,



Brantford, Stratford, Woodstock, Ingersoll and Guelph—to further the cause of public power.

As in all great public enterprises, a champion had arisen. His hand was behind the deputation that waited upon this House. He was a tireless organizer, a man who refused to accept defeat in any measure. To him we owe the culmination of the dreams of those men who pioneered for public ownership of power. He was hon. Adam Beck, Minister Without Portfolio in the Whitney Cabinet.

Adam Beck introduced a Bill to this House entitled: "An Act to Provide for the Transmission of Electric Power to the Municipalities." The Act was largely his, but much of the legal wording of the legislation was done by that great man, the then Chief Justice of Ontario, Sir William Meredith. On May 14, 1906, the Act received Royal Assent, and became part and parcel of the way of life that developed in our province.

The first commission was officially appointed on June 7, 1906, hon. Adam Beck being named chairman, with hon. J. S. Hendrie and Cecil B. Smith as the other two commissioners.

Thus was born The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, popularly known today as "Ontario Hydro."

Today, almost a half-century to the day from that historic date, I stand before this House, Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the government on the present commission, charged with the duty of reporting to you upon the past, the present, and the future of the great organization that was created by an Act of Legislature as a "people's business". That I embark upon this privilege humbly is simple recognition of the fact that the ramifications of Ontario Hydro are today so vast, its achievements and progress so outstanding, that it would be presumptuous of me to do otherwise.

Since I took office on the commission on August 17, 1955, I have considered it my duty to learn all that I can about the commission's operations. I realize

the great contribution to the progress of Hydro made by my distinguished colleagues and predecessors.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the members of this House remember, as I do, the faithful and untiring public service rendered by the late Robert H. Saunders. During the time he was chairman of Ontario Hydro, from March, 1948 until his untimely death on January 16, 1955, following an aircraft accident, he exemplified a devotion to duty that commanded respect and admiration throughout this province.

I think it is most fitting that the powerhouse on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence will bear the name "The Robert H. Saunders-St. Lawrence Generating Station." Mr. Saunders not only dreamed the dream of St. Lawrence power, as so many had done before him, but he was one of the most dynamic architects of its reality.

I remember, too, the proud record of my distinguished predecessors, especially hon. George H. Challies who performed such outstanding service for years as first vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro.

What I have learned, I report to you, conscious that were I to be in this office for many more years to come, I should still be able to give you the mere highlights of a publicly-owned concern that has grown, in a comparatively short space in historical time, to the point where it has been authoritatively referred to as "the third largest business in Canada", with fixed assets in excess of \$1.5 billion, operating 64 hydro-electric and 2 major fuel-electric generating stations and distributing power throughout the province over more than 16,000 circuit miles of transmission lines, serving directly and indirectly nearly 1½ million customers throughout this province of ours, and giving direct employment to more than 17,000 of our fellow citizens.

I can but touch upon such matters of fact as that Ontario Hydro owns and operates its own fleet of helicopters for transmission line patrol, the most

modern, economical and efficient way to perform such important work; that Ontario Hydro's research laboratory has quietly, through the years, conferred great benefits not only upon our province but upon the world, with the results of its research that it has so unselfishly shared with one and all. Also, that Ontario Hydro has made wide use of hydraulic scale models, saving the people of this province millions of dollars in the execution of its great Niagara and St. Lawrence projects, and ensuring efficiency of design for these developments so important to the welfare of each and every one of us.

There are so many unique things about our Ontario Hydro of which I could speak that I would have time for little else in this report, were I to list them all.

It would be impossible for me to give you more than a fleeting impression of how well the affairs of Ontario Hydro are carried out by the men you have charged with the responsibility of conducting its affairs. My colleagues on the commission make me feel proud to be numbered among them. The chairman of the commission, Dr. Richard L. Hearn, is a person for whom I have the greatest admiration and respect as an administrator, as a professional engineer of world renown, and as a man. My fellow vice-chairman, W. Ross Strike, Q.C., is a man of great learning, an accomplished and able speaker, who contributes much from his great store of knowledge of Hydro affairs.

As a commissioner, Lt. Col. A. A. Kennedy, president of the OMEA, has proved himself a tower of strength, and ably represents the municipalities.

The administrative affairs of Ontario Hydro are in the extremely able hands of the general manager, A. W. Manby, while Dr. Otto Holden, the chief engineer, needs no introduction as an engineer whose reputation is world-wide.

There are men whose lives have been dedicated to Hydro—men whose loyalty and devotion to duty have found full expression over a long number of years.

I beg to report, sir, that I find this attitude of service extends right down through the more than 17,000 employees of Ontario Hydro, whether they be at head office or in one of the 9 hydro regions. Indeed, in my travels about the province, and in my attendance at various functions where the municipalities meet under the banner of the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, I have seen evidence at all times of this spirit. We at Hydro, and the people of the province in general, are extremely fortunate in the high calibre of individual who offers himself or herself for election to the commissions of the municipalities.

The year through which we have just passed is a good example of the continuing growth of Ontario Hydro, which ranks among the great electric public utilities of the world. It has been a year of progress and achievement. Furthermore, it has been a year that has demonstrated remarkably the capacity of the commission's officials to take a long look ahead and plan for the expanding economy of our province, which depends, and will depend even more in the future, upon adequate supplies of electricity. I can report to you, Mr. Speaker, that I feel 1955 is a year of which Ontario Hydro and its ultimate owners, the people of Ontario, can be justly proud.

Much of the credit for our success can be attributed to the co-operation of our customers, contractors and suppliers; to the men and women of labour; to municipal officials; and to the press, radio, television and news services which have given such excellent coverage to our activities and achievements on behalf of Ontario's people.

Approximately 10 per cent. of the total work by Ontario Hydro on its share of the St. Lawrence Power Project, which it is constructing in co-operation with its partner, the Power Authority of the State of New York, was completed by the end of 1955. All the preliminary work was accomplished and construction is expected to continue at a greatly accelerated pace. Thirty-two contracts, involving expenditures of

more than \$80 million, were let during the year.

The first major contract was completed, with the construction of two cofferdams to block the north channel of the river and the dewatering of the powerhouse site. Completed last June, these cofferdams permitted the draining off of some 650 million gallons of water from a 2½-mile sector of the river, in order that the powerhouse might be built "in the dry." Early in the summer, Hydro's largest contract was let, for the building of the Ontario powerhouse. By the end of the year, some 800,000 cubic yards of material had been excavated from this site.

The rehabilitation of families, who will be affected by the flooding along the north bank of the St. Lawrence River, is undoubtedly one of the most important aspects of this development. At the site of the new Village of Iroquois, substantial progress was made in laying new streets and installing public services. By the end of the year, some 70 homes had been moved to new locations, and construction of the main business centre of the relocated municipality had begun.

Rehabilitation work was also started on the sites of New Towns No. 1 and No. 2. In Morrisburg, surveys and layouts for sewers and watermain, sewage treatment plant location, buildings to be moved, and new sites for buildings, were in progress and are continuing.

The Power Authority of the State of New York has also been hard at work, charged as it is with the construction of the American powerhouse as well as the Long Sault and Iroquois Dams. Present plans call for the closure of the Long Sault Dam, to establish a head-pond in 1958.

Between mid-1958 and mid-1960, the 16 generating units of the Ontario powerhouse will be placed in service by Ontario Hydro, with a total installed capacity of 820,000 kilowatts. That works out to about 1,100,000 horsepower.

When I speak of the Ontario powerhouse of the St. Lawrence Power Pro-

ject, I think of a great man who not only dreamed the dream of St. Lawrence power, as so many had done before him, but was also one of the most dynamic architects of its reality. On January 16, 1955, this man, while still comparatively young and with unimpaired vigour, with much of achievement yet ahead of him, died tragically in the service of the people. It is some compensation to know that, before he died, he was aware that the powerhouse of the great dream would become a reality, and that it would be named in his honour: "The Robert H. Saunders - St. Lawrence Generating Station."

There are frontiers in the vast northern section of Ontario that must be pushed back, if our province is to reach its full potential. Much of the success of the ventures being undertaken in the remote reaches of our province—mining, pulp and paper, the frontier farm—hinges upon a dependable supply of electricity. That is why, a pioneer itself, Ontario Hydro extends its generating stations and transmission lines into the far north to meet the power needs of new communities and farming areas.

The surveying of land where perhaps a white man has not trod before, the transporting of men and equipment into the northern fastness, the construction of power developments and the lines that feed from them, are all in the day's work to Hydro's surveyors and construction crews. Yet this very same work is of paramount importance in the development of hitherto untapped resources of our province.

All through the past year, some 400 men of Ontario Hydro were at work on the new Manitou Falls Generating Station on the English River, approximately 250 miles northwest of Fort William. The area was so remote that a 13-mile access road had to be built. Hydro men have been working and living there for two years, in order that northwestern Ontario may have the power it needs.

Their work has been fruitful. By April of this year, the station at Manitou Falls is scheduled for initial service. All



4 units of the plant, with a total capacity of 54,400 kilowatts, are expected to be in service by this July, and provision has been made for the possible installation at a later date of a fifth unit. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that two years ago there was nothing at Manitou Falls but an untouched wilderness.

Last August, the commission authorized the development of Whitedog Falls in northwestern Ontario. This generating station, with the romantic-sounding name that has the very breath of our northland in it, will be located on the Winnipeg River, about 13 miles east of the Manitoba boundary and 30 miles northwest of Kenora. Three units, with a combined capacity of 54,000 kilowatts, will be installed at Whitedog Falls, and initial power is expected to be generated in December, 1957.

Thus is Ontario Hydro discharging its duty of assisting in creating new wealth and opportunity for our province.

So much has been written about Ontario Hydro's new Sir Adam Beck-Niagara Generating Station No. 2 at Queenston that I am certain the mammoth job of construction undertaken by Hydro at this plant, which will have an ultimate capacity of 1,370,000 kilowatts, is familiar to all. It is a pleasure to report, sir, that with the addition in 1955 of 5 units, the great Niagara Project was completed in its 12-unit stage by August, with an installed capacity of 900,000 kilowatts. In January of this year, the commission announced that 4 additional 75,000-kilowatt generating units would be installed at this plant.

Following completion of the initial phase of the main project, construction emphasis was shifted to the pumped-storage scheme, a unique feature of the Niagara development. First such undertaking by Ontario Hydro, 6 reversible pump-turbines are to be installed in a pumping-generating station, located about a half-mile from the station proper and just to the north of the recently-constructed  $2\frac{1}{4}$  mile long open-cut canal.

These turbines will pump water from the main canal into a reservoir some

700 acres in extent and having a useable capacity of about 16,000 acre-feet. When operated in reverse by water returning from the reservoir, the pump-turbines will have a combined installed capacity of 170,000 kilowatts.

The water "stock-piled" in this reservoir also makes possible the operation of the additional 4 units in the powerhouse, to which I referred a few moments ago. All units of the pumping-generating station are scheduled for service in 1957.

Construction of the dyke forming the storage reservoir went ahead rapidly during the summer and fall of 1955, and, by the end of the year, 75 per cent. of this work had been completed. Excavation work for the offtake canal and the pumping-generating station was finished last year, and the first concrete for the station itself was placed in August.

The addition of these new facilities was made possible under the terms of the Niagara Diversion Treaty of 1950 which, for the first time, provided for specified amounts of water flowing over the falls at all times and also for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the falls.

To fulfil its terms, however, it was necessary to construct certain remedial works in the Niagara River, on and adjacent to the falls. These works are being carried out jointly by Canada and the United States, with Ontario Hydro as the Canadian agent.

They include a control structure on the Canadian side of the river, about a mile upstream from the falls, the excavation of certain river-bed areas, and the placing of fill in other areas on both flanks of the falls. The work of excavating and placing of fill was completed on the United States side by the corps of engineers, United States Army, in 1954, and on the Canadian side by Ontario Hydro in 1955.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct your attention to the highly gratifying progress which is being made in carrying out the frequency standardization in southwestern Ontario. This, as you know, is a tremendous project—

indeed, I believe it is the largest of its kind ever undertaken in any country. The exhaustive research and planning done by the commission in co-operation with some of the world's leading consultants on frequency standardization before we embarked on this programme are now history.

One of the first and most important decisions to be made was how the work was to be accomplished to meet our objectives. With large blocks of new generation scheduled to be placed in service at 60 cycles in 1950, it was essential that the standardization programme get under way at the earliest possible date; in other words, time was of the essence.

At the time, the commission was engaged on a tremendous expansion programme and it was in no position to make an immediate start on frequency standardization with its own forces; moreover, it was realized that such a course of action would involve a very large increase in staff with attendant placement problems at the conclusion of the programme.

All things considered, it was decided that it would be preferable to have the work done under contract with the commission, through its Frequency Standardization Division, retaining full control of the overall direction of the programme and closely supervising engineering and accounting methods and procedures, as well as retaining control of all purchases made on behalf of the commission.

Obviously, it was not possible to have the work done on a firm price basis, as this would have meant an actual inventory being taken, before the work commenced, of every piece of equipment to be changed over and an allocation of the amount of money for each piece of equipment involved. A survey of the whole 25-cycle area would have taken 2 or 3 years and would have involved a great deal of money, and, when completed, would not have afforded a firm basis for a contract because of changing conditions which would occur during progress of the operation. Therefore,

it was decided that the only sound method of payment which could be used was a percentage fee based on cost.

It should be kept in mind that the commission had already planned a special frequency standardization division which closely supervises all phases of the work performed by the contractor.

As you know, after the fullest possible consideration had been given to all problems and circumstances involved, it was decided that the commission should enlist the services of the Canadian Comstock Company. Through the co-operation of L. K. Comstock Company in the United States, the Canadian Comstock Company Limited was able to obtain sufficient experienced personnel to provide the nucleus of a strong field organization. The key personnel were tentatively reserved by the Canadian Comstock Company and recruited from the staffs of the organizations which had carried out the work of standardizing the Southern California Edison Company's 50-cycle system to 60 cycles—a project which involved some 750,000 customers and 1,700,000 horsepower.

The fee quoted by the Canadian Comstock Company was as much as 3 per cent. lower than that paid to one of the organizations which carried out standardization work in California. Also, the company in its proposal included as part of its overhead 11 key personnel plus office and storage space, which in total was estimated to be worth a minimum of \$190,000 a year to the commission.

It had been originally estimated that the cost of the overall programme of standardizing frequency in southwestern Ontario would be in the order of \$191 million. This was based on a saturation of 2.7 frequency-sensitive appliances for each domestic customer and an estimated total of 784,300 customers to be standardized.

These estimates were revised at the end of 1954 to 989,569 customers; at that time it was found that the average number of frequency-sensitive items to

be standardized per domestic customer had increased to 5.

I would like to emphasize that point, that the average number of frequency-sensitive items in which the cycle has to be changed from 25 to 60, increased from 2.7 to 5.

This same trend was indicated through 1955. The tremendous expansion of industry and population in Ontario has been the major cause of this increase, coupled with the increased use of electrical equipment brought about by an unprecedented demand on the part of the public for electrical appliances in the home and on the farm.

How would it have been possible to predict, in 1947, that the use of such items as oil burners, refrigerators, washing machines, driers, in fact almost all appliances would increase to the extent actually experienced? Even the most optimistic economists failed to foretell the unprecedented growth in Ontario following a world war. The inevitable result was, of course, steadily increasing prices of raw and fabricated materials as labour costs soared with the rising economy. Ontario Hydro, committed to a long-term frequency standardization programme, was involved in this "economic spiral".

Bringing about the tremendous increase in the scope of Ontario Hydro's frequency standardization project were many factors inherent in a thriving economy. For example, Ontario's population increased almost 1,100,000 between 1947 and the end of 1955.

During the same period, the number of manufacturing plants established in the province rose from 11,860 to over 13,600. Mechanization of industry in Ontario was a major factor in the increase in the gross value of manufactured products from approximately \$5 billion in 1947 to an estimated \$9.5 billion in 1955, placing a tremendous load upon the power facilities of this province.

With some of these factors in mind, the commission's frequency standardization project has been speeding forward. By the end of 1955, the programme was

almost two-thirds completed—with 62 per cent. of customers' premises already standardized, and 62 per cent. of the total number of items changed over. The standardization programme is heading towards an estimated conclusion by mid-1959, thereby reducing the original time by 3 to 4 years, with consequent economies in the overall total costs.

The total cost of the programme to the end of 1955 amounted to \$243,285,427, of which \$19,662,166 had been expended for equipment, supplies, and other assets to be used for future standardization work.

In regard to the overall cost, there is at present no change indicated. The late Ontario Hydro chairman, reporting to the Legislative Committee Commissions in 1954, said at that time:

Our consultants believe the cost of the programme may reach  $2\frac{1}{4}$  times that originally estimated. It is my hope that it will not exceed \$400 million.

While the magnitude and nature of this programme makes comparison with other projects almost impossible, it may be said that the efficiency and economies attained through strict control of contracting procedures, time and motion studies, advance power supply, and research into new methods, have made it an outstanding accomplishment.

As the programme moves on to its eighth year of active operation, I am happy to report that a total of 3,939,742 items have been standardized for some 617,260 customers.

The opinion seems to be prevalent in some quarters that Canadian Comstock Company Limited is the only contractor employed on frequency standardization work. In actual fact, a great many contractors have been and are being employed in this work. For example, during last year alone, 55 per cent. of the cost of industrial standardization was for work undertaken by contractors other than Comstock and for the whole programme up to the end of 1955 the corresponding figure was 44 per cent.



In addition, in some areas local contractors have grouped together to form work units of sufficient size and diversity to undertake domestic and commercial standardization under conditions approved by the commission. Up to the present time, some 280 electrical dealers and contractors have carried out scheduled standardization work entirely independent of that undertaken by Canadian Comstock Company.

In addition, there are approximately 1,000 dealers in electrical equipment who have undertaken non-scheduled standardization work which is required where a customer moves from a 25 to a 60-cycle area. At the present time, these moves are averaging 2,300 a month.

Today we are all able more fully to appreciate the many, far-reaching and long-term benefits frequency standardization will bring. Southwestern Ontario will no longer be an isolated 25-cycle island. On completion of this programme, the commission's entire power system will be better integrated and more flexible and this will result in more efficient use of its facilities and, consequently, help to lower costs.

Lack of 60-cycle power has been a detriment to attracting industry to the 25-cycle area and prevented our obtaining the full benefit of inter-connection with neighbouring utilities which would provide emergency stand-by facilities as well as a market for any surplus 60-cycle power which could not be used in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal now with rural electrification.

A milestone of interest to all, but particularly to those in rural areas, was passed by Ontario Hydro in 1955. Last June, Hydro added its 400,000th rural customer, and by the end of the year there were 418,836 customers in the rural areas receiving Hydro service.

In line with its policy of continued expansion of its rural facilities, Ontario Hydro, in 1955, added 28,219 rural customers, and 1,312 miles of rural line. It is estimated that in 1956 Hydro will

add 30,286 rural customers and 1,148 miles of rural line.

I am very pleased to announce it has been recently decided by the commission that in future a normal rural school contract will be credited with 5 units instead of 3 units as at present. This change is a concession to assist rural schools, in that it now permits construction of longer line extensions in each case. Since 1921 the government has provided "assistance" amounting to 50 per cent. of the capital cost of rural distribution facilities. From that time until the end of 1955 this has amounted to \$98,708,784, and in 1955 the grant-in-aid amounted to \$7,922,702.

In this golden jubilee year of Hydro, it is interesting to recall that the extension of electrical facilities to the rural areas has occupied the closest attention of the commission down through the years. The interest and concern of the first chairman, Sir Adam Beck, were reflected in a remark he made before a London audience on November 25, 1913. He said:

If I have helped the farmer to make life on the farm more attractive, to help keep boys and girls on the farm, then I have not laboured nor have you co-operated with me in vain.

Never one to speak without action, Sir Adam instituted what came to be known as "Adam Beck's circus"—a motor truck upon which had been mounted electrical appliances then available to the farmer and the farm wife. With these, Beck toured the rural areas of those days selling the cause of Hydro, and many a farmer was converted to the use of electricity through the chairman's personal efforts.

Adam Beck would be pleased to see the extent to which rural Ontario enjoys the blessing of Hydro today, with nearly 9 out of 10 farms in the province electrified. He would be glad, indeed, to know that, instead of the crude electric pumps and washing machines, which made up his "circus," there are today over 400 applications of electricity available to the modern farmer.

Ontario Hydro now maintains 105 rural operating areas throughout the province, and has instituted in many of these areas a programme of building offices and warehouses that are a credit to the communities and the customers they serve, as well as providing for greater efficiency of service.

I am attaching hereto, for the consideration of the hon. members, a record of the expansion programme from 1945 to 1955.

Those of us who live in Ontario, where our publicly-owned Hydro enterprise has become so intimately identified with our daily lives, have come to enjoy a very high standard of living. The steadily-increasing number and variety of electrical appliances in use in our homes, both in urban and rural areas, are a reliable indicator of our dependence upon Hydro.

As examples, I would like to cite certain figures on the number and use of electrical appliances for the year 1955, as compared with the year 1942, that I feel will bear out this contention. It is interesting to note the following figures:

Another reliable index of our dependence upon Hydro is to note how the average kilowatt hour consumption of Hydro's customers has mounted. In 1945, the average monthly kilowatt hour consumption per domestic customer was 205. But, in 1954, this had increased to 394 kilowatt hours—an increase of 92 per cent. Similarly, in the rural areas in 1945, the average monthly kilowatt hour consumption per customer was 169, whereas in 1954 it was 313—an increase of 85 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to have the privilege of reporting again to this House on Hydro matters before the end of this session. At that time, I propose to discuss such problems as "anticipated load growth in the years ahead" and "what the commission is doing to meet the tremendous challenge of the future," which many describe as the "atomic age".

When we contemplate that future—and we at Hydro face it with confidence—our past and present experiences cannot help but give us unlimited faith

| <i>Appliance</i>       | <i>1942<br/>No. in use</i> | <i>1955<br/>No. in use</i> | <i>Percentage<br/>increase</i> |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Oil Burners .....      | 62,300                     | 504,000                    | 709                            |
| Refrigerators .....    | 240,000                    | 1,162,000                  | 384                            |
| Vacuum Cleaners .....  | 290,400                    | 882,000                    | 204                            |
| Radios .....           | 669,100                    | 1,903,000                  | 184                            |
| Electric Ranges .....  | 185,400                    | 849,000                    | 358                            |
| Washing Machines ..... | 417,700                    | 1,134,000                  | 171                            |

The classic example of the increased use of an electrical appliance is, of course, the television set. Almost one million television sets have been delivered in Ontario since 1949. Think of that—one million television sets in little more than 6 years! Why, this one piece of electrical equipment alone, when taken collectively, represents the equivalent addition of the combined peak loads of Guelph, Kitchener, London, Windsor, and Port Arthur. It is marvellous to contemplate, and yet you can readily see what it means to Ontario Hydro in point of demand for power.

in the destiny of this province. We have seen the tremendous expansion of the power industry brought about by the people's needs—in agriculture, in industry, and in the home. We have been privileged to play a leading part in helping to raise the standard of living of our citizens. We have seen our expanding economy flourishing beyond belief, and yet we know from the practical figures presented by our engineers that we have merely entered upon the threshold of still greater power demands. Your Hydro stands ready to meet this challenge.

SUMMARY OF ONTARIO HYDRO'S POWER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME  
SINCE 1945

| <i>System and Development</i>  | <i>In service</i>    | <i>Dependable<br/>peak<br/>capacity</i> | <i>Approximate<br/>cost at<br/>Dec. 1955</i> |
|--|----------------------|---|--|
|  |                      | <i>kw</i>                               | <i>\$</i>                                    |
| <b>SOUTHERN ONTARIO SYSTEM</b>   |                      |   |  |
| DeCew Falls (extension)—Welland Canal .....                              | Sept. 1947           | 57,000                                  | 8,400,000                                    |
| Stewartville—Madawaska River .....                                       | Sept. 1948           | 63,000                                  | 12,300,000                                   |
| Additional power purchase contract—<br>Polymer Corporation .....         | Nov. 1948            | 22,000                                  |  |
| Emergency fuel-electric units .....                                      | Jan. 1949—Apr. 1950  | *                                       |  |
| Des Joachims—Ottawa River .....  | July 1950—Feb. 1951  | 372,000                                 | 73,200,000                                   |
| Chenau—Ottawa River .....  | Nov. 1950—Sept. 1951 | 117,000                                 | 29,200,000                                   |
| Otto Holden—Ottawa River .....   | Jan. 1952—Apr. 1953  | 210,000                                 | 57,500,000                                   |
| Richard L. Hearn—Toronto (4 units) .....                                 | Oct. 1951—June 1953  | 400,000†                                | 47,700,000                                   |
| (1 unit) .....   | 1958                 | 200,000†                                | 28,800,000‡                                  |
| J. Clark Keith—Windsor .....   | Nov. 1951—Oct. 1953  | 264,000†                                | 46,300,000                                   |
| Sir Adam Beck—Niagara No. 2—Niagara River<br>12 units (900,000 kw) ..... | Apr. 1954—Aug. 1955  |   |  |
| pumped storage (170,000 kw) .....  | 1957                 | 1,370,000†                              | 343,700,000‡                                 |
| 4 units (300,000 kw) .....   | 1957-1958            |   |  |
| Robert H. Saunders—St. Lawrence—<br>St. Lawrence River .....             | 1958-1960            | 820,000†                                | 300,000,000‡                                 |
| Nuclear Power Demonstration—near Des Joachims G.S. ....                  |                      | 20,000†                                 |  |
| <b>NORTHERN ONTARIO PROPERTIES</b>                                       |                      |   |  |
| <i>Northeastern Division</i>   |                      |   |  |
| George W. Rayner—Mississagi River .....                                  | July 1950            | 47,000                                  | 18,400,000                                   |
| <i>Northwestern Division</i>   |                      |   |  |
| Ear Falls (extension)—English River .....                                | June 1948            | 6,000                                   | 1,800,000                                    |
| Aguasabon—Aguasabon River .....  | Oct. 1948            | 44,000                                  | 12,600,000                                   |
| Pine Portage—Nipigon River .....   | July 1950—Dec. 1954  | 116,300                                 | 31,900,000                                   |
| Manitou Falls—English River .....  | ..... 1956           | 54,400                                  | 17,000,000‡                                  |
| Whitedog Falls—Winnipeg River .....                                      | 1957-1958            | 54,000                                  | 19,200,000‡                                  |

\*With the dismantling in early 1956 of the 20,000-kw Scarborough Generating Station, only the Steel Company of Canada station in Hamilton remains of the emergency fuel-electric stations brought into service during the period Jan. 1949—April 1950.

†Installed capacity.

‡Estimated cost upon completion.

February 16, 1956.

Mr. W. B. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. D. PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I wish to announce that we shall deal with a number of items on the Order paper, and continue with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer specify with which Orders we will proceed tomorrow?

HON. MR. PORTER: We will deal with as many as possible during the short time at our disposal.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, that is hardly fair to the Opposition. Surely the hon. Provincial Treasurer can advise us as to which Orders will be considered tomorrow.



HON. MR. PORTER: Very well. Orders No. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37.

MR. OLIVER: Is the House to deal with all those tomorrow?

HON. MR. PORTER: As many as we can, and I trust the hon. leader of the Opposition will be ready.

MR. OLIVER: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not being very co-operative. I would like to thank him very much.

HON. MR. PORTER: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday, the House will proceed with second reading of the Bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Ontario Water Resources Commission," which was introduced for first reading today.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 of the clock p.m.





# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

Friday, February 24, 1956

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Friday, February 24, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Presentation of reports, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 484 |
| Town of Leaside Act, Bill respecting, Mr. Pryde, second reading .....   | 484 |
| City of Woodstock Act, Bill respecting, Mr. Innes, second reading .....   | 484 |
| Chatham Board of Education and Chatham Suburban High School District, Bill<br>respecting, Mr. Parry, second reading ..... | 484 |
| City of Niagara Falls, Bill respecting, Mr. Kerr, second reading .....  | 484 |
| United Co-operatives of Ontario, Bill respecting, Mr. Oliver, second reading .....  | 484 |
| Society of Interior Decorators of Ontario, Bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, held .....                                       | 484 |
| Canadian National Exhibition Association, Bill respecting, Mr. Frost (Bracondale),<br>second reading .....                | 485 |
| Township of Etobicoke, Bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, second reading .....   | 485 |
| Town of Timmins, Bill respecting, Mr. Spooner, second reading .....   | 485 |
| City of Port Arthur, Bill respecting, Mr. Wardrope, second reading .....  | 485 |
| City of Windsor, Bill respecting, Mr. Yaremko, second reading .....   | 485 |
| Assumption College, Bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, second reading .....  | 485 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 486 |
| Proposing of certain resolutions, agreed to .....   | 486 |
| Sarnia General Hospital, Bill respecting, reported .....  | 487 |
| Canadian Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America,<br>Bill respecting, reported .....          | 488 |
| City of Peterborough, Bill respecting, reported .....   | 488 |
| Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Bill respecting, reported .....   | 488 |
| Board of Education for the City of Hamilton, Bill respecting, reported .....  | 488 |
| Protestant Home of St. Catharines, Bill respecting, reported .....  | 488 |
| Department of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 488 |
| Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, reported ..   | 488 |
| Separate Schools Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 489 |
| Public Schools Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 489 |
| Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, Bill to establish, reported ....  | 489 |
| Entry of Horses at Exhibitions Act, Bill to repeal, reported .....  | 489 |
| Seed Potatoes Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 490 |
| Ontario Food Terminal Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 490 |
| Farm Products Marketing Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 490 |
| Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 490 |
| Co-operative Loans Act, 1956, Bill intituled, reported .....  | 490 |
| Municipal Arbitrations Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 490 |
| Territorial Division Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 490 |
| Railway Fire Charge Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, second reading .....  | 490 |
| Crown Timber Act, 1952, Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, second reading .....   | 490 |
| Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne,<br>Mr. Cecile, Mr. Monaghan .....                                 | 499 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Pryde, agreed to .....  | 508 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....  | 508 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1956

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. C. E. MAPLEDORAM (Minister of Lands and Forests): I rise on the matter of personal privilege in relation to a news item which appears in the *Globe and Mail* today captioned:

MAPLEDORAM SAYS QUEBEC POLICIES  
DRIVE OUT FIRMS

Yesterday, February 23, I was at the Lakehead in relation to the reopening of an industry at that point which I may say is entirely an Ontario industry and is, and has been, operated by Ontario interests. In a subsequent interview at which there was a general discussion I referred to the very great development of this province, and particularly the northern part of it.

I had no intention of referring to the policies in effect in any other province or state or by any other government, and I regret if anything I said in any way could be interpreted as referring to policies in Quebec or any other place.

Ontario's development is solely due to the resources and policies which are in effect here and it was in no way my intention—nor is it our business in Ontario—to comment upon policies of other governments, and I sincerely regret that my remarks could have been so interpreted as I did not intend such interpretation to be placed upon them.

MR. G. LAVERGNE (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like, first, to express my appreciation to the hon. Attorney-General, who drew the attention of this House yesterday to the series of fatal accidents at level crossings. This was drawn forcibly to my attention in the past week, because in the riding of Russell, within the past 7 days, there have been 2 very serious accidents, which have taken the lives of no less than 6 people.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at the present time to commend the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) for the diligence he has shown in the matter. I feel sure the prompt action taken in this particular matter by the hon. Attorney-General in bringing it to the attention of those who have control of it—the Board of Transport Commissioners—will bring about good results in this respect.

We have had a series of these level crossing accidents in my riding, and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not bring this matter to the attention of this House, and of those who have control of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this particular subject, I would like to suggest to the hon. members of this House

—and perhaps to the Committee on Highway Safety—a matter which was brought to my attention by one of my constituents. Some of the accidents which have occurred have not proved fatal, but, nevertheless, they have been serious.

It may be that the department which has control of these matters should see fit that on the licences issued to drivers, where “height,” “age” and “sex” are shown, there should be added another detail—that is, the driver’s blood type. I imagine that would be of great assistance in many cases of accidents, especially where an accident results in injuries serious enough to require blood transfusion. The hospital authorities, by looking at the licence, would see immediately the type of blood required.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

1. Report of the Provincial Secretary of Ontario with respect to the administration of The Corporation Act, 1953, and The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

2. Report of the Provincial Secretary of Ontario with respect to the administration of Part XI, of The Corporation Act, 1953, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

#### TOWN OF LEASIDE ACT

Mr. T. Pryde, in the absence of Mr. Beckett, moves second reading of Bill No. 3, “An Act respecting the Town of Leaside.”

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### CITY OF WOODSTOCK ACT

Mr. G. Innes moves second reading of Bill No. 7, “An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.”

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### THE CHATHAM AND SUBURBAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS ACT

Mr. G. W. Parry moves second reading of Bill No. 11, “An Act respecting the Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District.”

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS ACT

Mr. D. M. Kerr, in the absence of Mr. Jolley, moves second reading of Bill No. 13, “An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.”

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### UNITED CO-OPERATIVES OF ONTARIO ACT

Mr. F. R. Oliver moves second reading of Bill No. 16, “An Act respecting The United Co-operatives of Ontario.”

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### THE SOCIETY OF INTERIOR DECORATORS OF ONTARIO ACT

Mr. A. H. Cowling moves second reading of Bill No. 24, “An Act respecting the Society of Interior Decorators of Ontario.”

MR. R. GISBORN: Could we have a brief explanation of the intent and purpose of this Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: These Bills were before the Private Bills Committees and the discussion should have taken place at that time.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would not object, if the hon. member desires an explanation.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): There is no reason why it should not be discussed here.



MR. COWLING: I would be glad to give the hon. member a short explanation of the Bill. It is simply a Bill to provide that a group of interior designers or interior decorators may join together to improve their service to the public, and to have, following their names, a designation, such as, "Interior Designer," very much the same as people do in the insurance business or in so many other walks of life, who, through study and qualifications, are entitled to use a designation after their names.

Mr. Speaker, as far as we were able to understand the matter in the committee on private Bills, the only people who will benefit by this is the public, who will receive better service and better designing.

HON. MR. FROST: It might be well to postpone the second reading of the Bill. It can be called again at a later date.

Second reading held.

#### CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ACT

Mr. A. Frost (Bracondale) moves second reading of Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE ACT

Mr. W. Murdoch, in the absence of Mr. Lewis, moves second reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### TOWN OF TIMMINS ACT

Mr. J. W. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the Town of Timmins."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### CITY OF PORT ARTHUR ACT

Mr. G. C. Wardrope moves second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### CITY OF WINDSOR ACT

Mr. J. Yaremko, in the absence of Mr. Davies, moves second reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

#### ASSUMPTION COLLEGE ACT

Mr. W. Murdoch moves second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act respecting Assumption College."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Bill represents the culmination of negotiations which have taken place in Windsor and Essex County for some time past.

It involves the establishment of a new university in Ontario—at least, a new name for and a wider field of service by, an old college—Assumption College.

The history of Windsor is very interesting indeed. The settlement of that community pre-dated the creation of Ontario, as such, by a Constitutional Act, by probably 75 years. The settlement of Windsor was in existence long before the Treaty of Paris, which I believe was signed in 1763. The land titles and the parish records in that fine community go back to the days of the French regime.

That is a fact which, historically, in Ontario is often overlooked. Assumption College had its genesis in the parishes of that community, going back well over 200 years—probably 225 years—into the oldest parishes in Canada west of the Ottawa River. Assumption College had its genesis generations ago, and the college has continued to grow

as part of a great and growing community, the city of Windsor and the county of Essex.

A year or two ago, we passed an Act permitting Assumption College to carry on alone, after years of affiliation with the University of Western Ontario, and to assume university status. I was very pleased to take part in the ceremonies which commemorated the commencement of that college some time ago. In the development of Windsor, and surrounding area in that portion of Ontario, we now have the creation of another college, Essex College. We have now a system of unification or confederation under which Assumption College and Essex College will work together, under the name of the "University of Windsor."

We want to extend to that community and to those who have been associated with the development of this idea, our very best wishes. The new university will come into the grant system this year.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. Edwards in the chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House that the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matters of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by hon. C. E. Mapledoram: Resolved that:

where the railway lands of an owner or tenant comprise fewer than 200 acres and such lands are not subject to tax under The Provincial Land Tax Act, the charge imposed by this Act is \$6,

a tenant of railway lands shall be jointly and severally liable with the owner for the payment of the charge imposed by this Act and it shall become due and payable on or before the first day of February in each year, as provided by Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by hon. D. Porter: Resolved that:

for the purpose of implementing the arrangements made or to be made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario to facilitate the construction of a connecting link through northern Ontario of a pipe line to transport natural gas from Alberta into central Ontario, the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to loan from time to time out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund any sum of money, but not more than \$35 million, to a corporation or to be constituted on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada and having as a purpose the construction aforesaid,

as provided by Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Northern Ontario Pipe Line Act.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? I think I am correct in saying that the Woods-Gordon report in connection with this matter was built upon a premise that the interest rate would be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Is that established, and is that to be the interest rate?

HON. MR. FROST: The interest rate was first discussed with the Federal Government and the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company. We took the position, when we came into the arrangement with the Federal Government, that the interest rate would be the going interest rate, and that was accepted. As you will notice for the purposes of calculation in the Glassco Report,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

—which seemed to be a realistic rate—was taken, because they had to use some rate of interest for calculations, but in the exchange of correspondence which constitutes the agreement between Canada and Ontario, you will notice that it is the “cost of money.”

From a conversation yesterday with the Rt. hon. C. D. Howe, as a matter of fact, I understand that The Department of Finance desires that a floor be put underneath the interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., leaving it, as it is now, that the cost of money would be whatever it is, but not less than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. We have no objection to that. It is a fiscal matter which, perhaps, makes it simpler to deal with it, from the Federal Government's standpoint. But our position was premised on the fact that there has been a very great variation in interest rates in the last 3 to 5 years. In the fall of 1950, after years of stable rates, the Federal Government removed its support to what we call the “Victory Loans or the Dominion of Canada War Issues,” which immediately had a very marked effect on interest rates, and that continued until the Korean war, when there were further controls made by way of bank rates, which had a great effect on interest rates.

In recent months—perhaps a year ago—due to the fact there was unemployment in the country, and industry was being stimulated, the bank rate was lowered, with the result that interest rates in Ontario fell to about the same level as they were in 1950.

There was, as hon. members know, with the great amount of industry and employment carried on, subsequently an increase in bank rates, which had its effect upon the interest rates which might, on long-term loans, amount to between  $3\frac{3}{4}$  or 4 per cent.

Our view is no one can estimate what the interest will be in the future, for loans such as this, but it should not cost the public anything, and accordingly, the arrangement was arrived at as contained in the letters. The Federal Gov-

ernment, I think, would like to place a floor under the rate of about  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.

Of course, that would not operate against us, but against the company, if we ran into a position such as occurred in the late 1950's when we borrowed money at 2.8 per cent. This would, of course, operate against them.

However, with no ceiling on it, we are in a position where we can always protect ourselves regarding interest rates, and make sure we are able to recoup ourselves, for the interest we have to pay.

MR. OLIVER: Perhaps I should know this, but will the hon. Prime Minister tell the House if he understands the interest rate to be a flexible thing, which bears relationship to the changes in the cost of money?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Over the life of the contract it may vary from the floor of  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., or whatever it is?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. Our arrangement with regard to interest is contained in the exchange of correspondence between the hon. Provincial Treasurer and Rt. hon. Mr. Howe.

Resolution agreed to.

#### SARNIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

House in committee on Bill No. 2, “An Act respecting The Sarnia General Hospital.”

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Bills on the Order paper which are routine and technical in effect. If any hon. member has a question to ask or desires a Bill to be held over, I would be very glad to do that. I do not want to put these Bills through, nor in any way hurry their consideration, and if there is any



doubt about them, we will be very glad to hold them over.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

#### THE CANADIAN BOARD OF AMERICAN MISSIONS OF THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

House in Committee on Bill No. 6,  
"An Act respecting the Canadian Board  
of American Missions of the United  
Lutheran Church in America."

Sections 1 to 5 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

#### THE CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

House in Committee on Bill No. 9,  
"An Act respecting the City of Peter-  
borough."

Sections 1 to 4 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 9 reported.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

House in Committee on Bill No. 10,  
"An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific  
Railway Company."

Sections 1 to 4 agreed to.

Schedules "A" and "B" agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 10 reported.

#### THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF HAMILTON

House in Committee on Bill No. 19,  
"An Act respecting the Board of Edu-  
cation for the City of Hamilton."

Sections 1 to 5 agreed to.

Schedules "A", "B", "C", "D" and  
"E" agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

#### THE PROTESTANT HOME OF ST. CATHARINES

House in Committee on Bill No. 30,  
"An Act respecting The Protestant  
Home of St. Catharines."

Sections 1 to 5 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 30 reported.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 47,  
"An Act to amend The Department of  
Education Act, 1954."

On section 1:

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): May  
I ask the hon. Minister if the bursaries  
which were arranged with Ottawa apply  
to the Ontario Agricultural College? Is  
the hon. Minister now putting through  
his department the bursaries which are  
distributed through the college?

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister  
of Education): We have some at the  
Ontario Agricultural College, but I have  
forgotten how many.

MR. OLIVER: Is there no agree-  
ment at the moment between the Federal  
and Provincial Governments in relation  
to these bursaries?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Not espe-  
cially with relation to the bursaries. We  
have a number of agreements on various  
phases of educational training, but the  
officials would like to have these legal-  
ized, to enable us to proceed in a formal  
manner. We hope to have more money  
and, therefore, would like definite agree-  
ments.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 47 reported.

#### THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT, 1954

House in Committee on Bill No. 48,  
"An Act to amend The Secondary  
Schools and Boards of Education Act,  
1954."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 48 reported.

#### THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 49,  
"An Act to amend The Separate Schools  
Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 49 reported.

#### THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 55,  
"An Act to amend The Public Schools  
Act."

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 55 reported.

#### THE LAKEHEAD COLLEGE OF ARTS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

House in Committee on Bill No. 56,  
"An Act to establish the Lakehead Col-  
lege of Arts, Science and Technology."

On section 1:

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Chairman, while this Bill was in Committee—in fact near the end of its deliberations—a question was raised regarding the name, the suggestion being that "Lakehead" is rather a restrictive connotation and might be considered as applying to only the two cities, Port Arthur and Fort William, whereas it is understood the college is to serve all of the northwestern portion of the province.

I think the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) said, at the time, he had no objection to a change of name. May I ask if any thought has been given to a name which would immediately convey to the people of northwestern Ontario the fact that the university is to serve that entire district? I do not know whether "Northwestern" would be confused with "Western University" inasmuch as we already

have one by that name, in southern Ontario.

It occurred to me that perhaps some thought might be given to this, and if there is to be a change made, perhaps it should be done at this time.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The institute we have there now is the "Lakehead Technical Institute," and if we depart from that and call it something else, there is a possibility we would be in difficulty. However, there is one point about which I have thought several times, and that is the possibility of confusion between "Western" and "Northwestern." There might be a conflict there. I think, however, Mr. Chairman, for the present, we might leave it as it is.

MR. MacDONALD: Could the name "Aurora University" be considered? That might undercut the problem of secession about which we hear at times in that portion of the province.

HON. MR. FROST: I was going to suggest that name myself. I would say, Mr. Chairman, as regards the name; later on, as the college develops, a change in name might be considered advisable. Personally, I would not consider "Lakehead" to be the best name, but it is a name which has been used for a great many years.

I had thought of "Aurora University," but then, again, that might be confused with the great Town of Aurora, just north of Toronto, and there might also be some difficulty there.

Sections 1 to 17 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 56 reported.

#### THE ENTRY OF HORSES AT EXHIBITIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 40,  
"An Act to repeal The Entry of Horses  
at Exhibitions Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.  
Bill No. 40 reported.

## THE SEED POTATOES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 81,  
"An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes  
Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 81 reported.

THE ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL  
ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 82,  
"An Act to amend The Ontario Food  
Terminal Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 82 reported.

THE FARM PRODUCTS  
MARKETING ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 83,  
"An Act to amend The Farm Products  
Marketing Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 83 reported.

THE JUNIOR FARMER  
ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1952

House in Committee on Bill No. 84,  
"An Act to amend The Junior Farmer  
Establishment Act, 1952."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 84 reported.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS  
ACT, 1956

House in Committee on Bill No. 85,  
"The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956."  
Sections 1 to 17 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 85 reported.

MUNICIPAL ARBITRATIONS  
ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 51,  
"An Act to amend The Municipal Arbi-  
trations Act."

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 51 reported.

## TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 59,  
"An Act to amend the Territorial Divi-  
sion Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 59 reported.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the Com-  
mittee do now rise and report certain  
resolutions and certain Bills without  
amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in  
the Chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth):  
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the  
Whole House begs to report it has come  
to certain resolutions, and passed several  
Bills without amendment, and begs  
leave to sit again.

Report adopted.

THE RAILWAY FIRE  
CHARGE ACT

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves second  
reading of Bill No. 60, "An Act to  
amend The Railway Fire Charge Act."

He said: The amendments to The  
Railway Fire Charge Act bring the pro-  
cedures under that Act into line with  
the procedures set out in The Provincial  
Land Tax Act. This overcomes the  
duplication in administration, and in the  
case of small holdings, it does away with  
double taxation. Parcels under 200  
acres are exempt from railway fire  
charges if they are subject to provincial  
land tax; where parcels under 200 acres  
are not subject to provincial land tax,  
they are subject to a railway fire charge,  
but this amount is reduced from \$12.80  
to \$6.

A further amendment provides that  
the railway fire charge does not apply  
in municipalities or on land, wherever  
situate, used in connection with a place  
of worship or churchyard, cemetery or  
burying ground.

Motion agreed to; second reading of  
the Bill.



## CROWN TIMBER ACT

Hon. Mr. Mapledoram moves second reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act, 1952."

He said: Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the Bill contains a provision which will permit entering into agreements similar to those with the Hinde and Dauch Company, for a supply of timber for a mill over a period of years to take care of a part of its annual requirements. Such an agreement does not tie up the Crown management unit, and timber in excess of the requirements of the mill can be made available to other operators to the extent of the productive capacity of the area.

Section 2 of the Bill takes care of the situation where timber is cut in an unlicensed area, and, where the person responsible disputes the boundary line, a survey can be ordered, and if the survey establishes that there has been unauthorized cutting, the person responsible is liable for the cost of the survey.

Section 3 of the Bill says that no operator can commence cutting in any year until he has received written permission. This provision permits this permission to be withheld in the case of a licensee who is financially insecure and is in arrears in the payment of Crown charges.

Under section 4, for many years it has been the practice of the department to issue clearances for export of timber. In fact, the customs officials require any person, wanting to export timber, to produce such a clearance from the department. The department requires an applicant for a clearance to make an affidavit as to the source of the timber.

However, any such applicant making a false statement cannot be successfully prosecuted under the Criminal Code, for the reason that there is no statutory requirement for the affidavit. The provision of the Bill requires that any person seeking a customs clearance from the department for the export of timber shall make a written declaration.

Section 5 of the Bill dispenses with the requirement that cutting records be

verified under oath. This amendment has the approval of the department, and of industry, for the reason that the Act required a person to take an oath who could not be in possession of all the facts of the matter. These records, which are not used in determining Crown charges, are prepared by persons having only hearsay knowledge, usually the oral reports of cutters and teamsters, and it was felt it was improper to require an oath under such circumstances.

Sections 6 and 7 of the Bill extend the scope of the lien for Crown charges on Crown timber. Under these amendments, Crown charges are liens against any timber cut by licensees, under any licence. Hitherto, Crown charges owing on timber cut under a particular licence were not a lien against other timber cut under another licence.

Section 8 of the Bill is to correct the faulty wording of section 40(3) of the Act. This section refers to the measuring of pulpwood in cubic feet of solid wood, and the conversion of 85 cubic feet of solid wood into 128 cubic feet of stacked wood. This conversion factor was in reverse, and the amendment will correct this.

Section 9 of the Bill, The Crown Timber Act, 1952, repealed the former Provincial Forests Act, and merely provided that the provincial forests would be continued. There are occasions when lands in provincial forests are required for town sites, and should be withdrawn from the forests. Also provision should be made for the sale of land in provincial forests where such sale or disposition is not inconsistent with the purpose of the forest.

For example, lands for summer resort sites are not inconsistent with the purpose of the forest, for the reason that the timber is reserved to the Crown. On the other hand, a sale of land for agricultural purposes would be inconsistent with the purposes of the forest, and such a sale should not be made. Section 9 of the Bill provides for these things.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister does not seem to have dealt with certain points. In the news story carried

after the first reading of this Bill, there was a suggestion that it had come into being to improve a situation in the Trent Valley Watershed, that of one mill that was about to be closed because it did not have sufficient raw material, and by the establishment of this forest management unit, it was going to provide this mill with material, so it could continue in existence.

Is that the case? Is this Bill to be applicable throughout the whole province, or is it, as the news story suggested, a sort of a "pilot project", by way of which we are moving towards establishment of a forest management programme?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I think you are correct in assuming this would apply to any place in Ontario. The mill to which you are referring was a management unit. The Hinde and Dauch Company were looking for a supply of wood, instead of straw, for their mill, and we guaranteed them wood from that area. They are not operating under licence, as no licence was given, but it is still retained in the Crown. We supply wood to that mill, but that is only a portion of the over-all amount of wood which can be given to that management unit; 25,000 tons of it are designated, to supply an amount of wood to that mill, which can be added to by purchases in other places.

Just to follow through, that same thing can be applied to other management units across the province. We needed a firm commitment for a certain amount of wood. They wanted a firm commitment, but they did not want to take out a licence, or, rather, we did not want to issue a licence to take in the whole area. Does that answer your question?

MR. MacDONALD: It answers it in part, but I have had great difficulty, after reading the releases which come from The Department of Lands and Forests, as to what the policies now are in connection with our forests, as to the extent we have moved towards the operation of management units.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: It is an entirely new departure.

MR. MacDONALD: Up until now, we have not had management units.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I am saying here we are designating a specific amount of wood from a management unit to a certain industry. As it was before, it was not tied to any industry. Small companies could be given licences, go in there, and sell wherever they wanted to, but in this way you can keep an industry going in a particular section, and sustain it.

MR. MacDONALD: I think I have it quite clear now. Since this is a principle and we are, on second reading, dealing with the principles of the Bill, I want to draw to the attention of the House that it is a principle which we have been moving gingerly towards for a long time, and until we have implemented it and implemented it fully, we are not going to be able to halt what I think is the continued destruction of the forests in this province.

For instance, if you look at page one of the "White Paper" which was released a year or so ago, there is a paragraph which reads as follows:

These great resources were vested in the province at the time of Confederation as a trust to be administered for the benefit of the people of this province, and at that time the central government intended them as a source of revenue for the new province.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to suggest if it is an accurate statement that forest resources of this country were vested in trust with the province, there is no other conclusion to which one can come, when one looks at what has happened down through the years, but this government and successive governments—not only this government—have betrayed this trust.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I do not agree with that.

MR. MacDONALD: Just a moment now. A year or so ago I went to northern Ontario and made a statement like this and the hon. Minister made a very profound remark. His comment was that I "did not know one end of the tree from the other." The interesting thing was I was quoting from the government's own reports, so, by analogy, the government's reports "do not know one end of the tree from the other" either.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: The remark to which the hon. member is referring was made at Kakabeka Falls. The hon. member made a remark concerning a certain section of the Bill; and did not continue on with the "White Paper"; he stopped at a certain spot, without reading the whole thing.

MR. MacDONALD: I have, strange as it may seem, the release of the speech I made at Kakabeka Falls right here.

HON. MR. FROST: Was this a CCF meeting?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and believe it or not, I can assure the hon. members that we have a group in Kakabeka Falls.

MR. OLIVER: "Wherever 2 or 3 are gathered together, etc."

MR. MacDONALD: That is right. I want to go back to something which I think is important, incidental to my proposition. I want to show that this is a long-term programme with which we have been coming to grips, and I am glad to see the government is now moving.

However, my suggestion is that it is a rather feeble move in the direction of doing things which should have been done years ago. I have here, by strange coincidence, a report on the Trent Watershed survey. I say "strange coincidence," because apparently one of the things which caused this Bill to be drafted was the necessity of meeting the needs of a mill on the Trent Watershed

survey. If it did not get this material, it was going to close up. The interesting thing is that this report—

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: That is not a completely true statement, that the mill was going to close up. I think it was safe, as a wood operation, but it was originally designed to make paper out of straw, and they were finding it a little difficult to get straw, but they could still operate.

MR. MacDONALD: I was basing my statement on the *Globe and Mail* report.

The thing I want to draw to your attention is that this Trent Watershed survey is dated 1913. This was made as one of a series of surveys by a commission on conservation of the Federal Government, and just let me read one or two paragraphs from page 15 of this to show you how old it is. We are now in the year 1956, some 43 years later.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That was one year before the First War.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out to the hon. member there are all sorts of things in this province that have been "hanging around" for 50 or 60 years?

MR. MacDONALD: Waiting for this government to look after them.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, waiting for this government to come along and take care of them.

MR. MacDONALD: Alright; let us look at this. I am intrigued by the sensitivity of the front benchers when we get to an issue which has been inactive for so long.

Nobody who has studied the conditions presented in this report will hesitate a moment in agreeing that the bulk of the country involved should be placed in, and managed as, a permanent forest reserve for the growing of timber.



Then on the next page, they go on to explain how this can be done. They point out, for instance, that it needs the co-operation of 3 levels of government; that the most natural owners of these forest reserves are undoubtedly the municipalities, as representatives of the people who are on the ground. Two or three pages later, they go on to point out—this is 1913, Mr. Speaker—that there must be an association between the municipalities and the senior governments, and they say the first step is for the province to take what would appear to be steps to repossess themselves of the licenced lands which have practically ceased to produce the quantity of logs contemplated under the original licences.

In other words, in 1913, they were spelling out the fact that this industry was in a period of decline, that the government had, by the terms of Confederation, been given the trust, and the provincial government should do something, and it was indicated pretty clearly what should be done.

Let us go down through the years; in 1947, some 34 years later, the Conservative Government in the Province of Ontario appointed Major-General Kennedy as a commissioner, and he brings in a report in which he emphasizes that the lumber industry in the Province of Ontario is within 25 years of extinction, in terms of a sizeable commercial proposition.

In other words, these resources have been permitted to be destroyed. When I say there has been a "betrayal of trust" in permitting these resources to be destroyed until they are within 25 years of extinction I am merely quoting Major-General Kennedy. He warned—I am quoting from memory—that in 25 years the lumber industry would dwindle to a point where it would be a major tragedy. Therefore, he pointed to the necessity of establishing forest operating companies.

Some of the things which I would judge a forest operating company would have to do are included in this Bill, namely, to see there was cutting on a scientific basis, and that these products would be directed to existing industries,

or into new industries which may be brought in, and built up on the basis of available resources.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the only difference between the solution suggested by Major-General Kennedy, on forest operating companies—and he took the whole province and divided it into areas—and what the CCF asked for in its statement to that commission, was that Major-General Kennedy recommended that the operating company would be some sort of a joint partnership with the various companies in the area, and our claim was that was an unworkable procedure. Our suggestion was that these operating companies should be Crown companies which would co-ordinate their activities with the work of the department, such as reforestation. It may be interesting if I quote a couple of sections in which Major-General Kennedy—in chapter 21, page 178 of the report—came to a conclusion:

I do not consider that it is, or ever will be, possible to achieve the rational development of forest resources or to maintain our present industries under the existing plan of limit allocation, with the confusing and conflicting agreements and conditions in force.

In other words, this unco-ordinated granting of licences is a kind of procedure which results in confusion and does not admit of the implementing of a modern forest-management programme, precisely the point which was made away back in the 1913 commission report.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, the provision for complete management units wherever necessary is the answer to this problem.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I have very great difficulty in figuring out exactly the extent to which they are set up, and exactly what areas they have covered.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, the only difference in having them operated by us, or having the

municipality operate them, is that they are, in fact, operated under The Department of Lands and Forests, and we establish the principles and everything that is to be done and also deal with the operating costs.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. Minister is on his feet, I would like to ask to what extent these forest management companies are operating in the limits in the north, where there are big corporations? Are they working within the terms of the forest management set-up?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, not at present. We started work in the southern end of the province, where the need was greater. There are cases under The Crown Timber Act where they are given certain rights, and a great deal has been done in that regard. What we are in closest touch with is the Petawawa Management Unit, which has worked out well. Now, after 10 years' cutting, and having worked on a 20-year cycle, we will be able to go back in 10 years and cut more timber than we had when we started.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that after I have quoted further relevant extracts from the Kennedy Report. Just let me continue. The hon. Minister has already made his speech.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: The hon. member is criticizing, and I want to give him some of the answers.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I am going to have my say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for York South has the floor.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to this comment by the hon. Minister with respect to the fact that there are not very many of these in the north. We are starting in

the south. There is the nub of the problem. First, let me revert to some comments appearing in the Kennedy Report:

I am convinced that unless vigorous remedial measures are soon taken, the lumber industry will continue to diminish in importance to such an extent that before 25 years it will be classed as a minor industry, which would be a major tragedy.

If this should happen, it will very severely affect every farmer, home-builder, mine, railway or industrial enterprise which uses lumber or timber. A high mortality rate amongst secondary industries dependent upon sawmills may also be anticipated.

Then, in a section which he describes as "Principles Applied in Solution of Problem", he gives the first principle as follows:

In future government action, the principle of sustained yield must ever apply. Any other course will spell eventual disaster to many of our existing industries and the communities they support.

Now there, once again, is the 1947 version of what we should do to cope with this problem. I repeat, it is essentially the same kind of a solution which was pointed out in the Conservation Report of 1913. In 1954, we had the "White Paper", which spells it out once again. Now in 1956, we have the government introducing a Bill to implement it, and which gives the hon. Minister some authority to do what has been clearly a necessity for nearly two generations, and it was said they were about to cease the foolish destruction of the forest resources of this province.

Let no hon. member ignore for a moment the fact—and this is not my statement, it is a statement in the government's own documents—that in the year 1947, we were within 25 years of the extinction of the lumber industry in this province. Seven years later, the "White Paper" came in and, by the straight use of elementary mathematics, states that we are within 17

years of the destruction of those resources.

In other words, nothing was done in the intervening 7 years, other than the forest inventory programme. They had counted the trees, but had done nothing to set up a modern forest programme to try and halt the foolish destruction of the resource.

Mr. Speaker, pulpwood is not within the terms of the present Bill, because presumably it will not deal with pulpwood. However, the interesting thing is that the "White Paper" warns that within 20 years in the Province of Ontario, with what we believe to be almost unlimited resources of pulpwood, we will have reached the peak, beyond which it will level off and start to decline, just as the lumber industry in this province levelled off in 1908 or 1910, and has been declining ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Minister that I am very glad to hear he is bringing in a Bill to deal with this matter, but it is 50 years too late. After recommendations from innumerable commissions the hon. Minister now says that something should be done.

I am delighted to see he has brought in a Bill, but, by his own statement, up to now none of these units are in operation.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I did not say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: We can take a look at the record.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I said "not too many", Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I accept the correction.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I said it started in southern Ontario 10 years ago. It has been in operation in Petawawa.

MR. MacDONALD: Now the hon. Minister is bringing in something about "southern Ontario".

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confusing the issue. Does he want me to give it twice? I said these units are in operation, and wherever the people in the areas want to sell wood, they can do so.

MR. MacDONALD: In other words, it is not a management unit.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, it was a management unit in the sense that a good deal of timber should be harvested each year, and it has been doing that on a sustained basis. At this particular time, we are discussing the future of the industry. This Act affords the right to do that, as in any other industry.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I see now that the hon. Minister has put a few more "teeth" in these forest-management units.

My point is that, after all these years, we are finally getting around to doing something which is absolutely necessary to save the forest resources of the province. By the hon. Minister's own statement a few moments ago, we have not too many of these units.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member want me to give the exact figures, and the amount of timber cut? If he wishes it, I will get those figures.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have them, because this is an issue I intend to raise many times, until I get an assurance that there is a new policy implemented.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, I am not a bit ashamed of what we are doing in relation to forest-management units across this province. If the hon. member would sit down for a few minutes, I would tell him a couple of other things.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister has been continually talking and I have been sitting down.



HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been making statements here, and I wish to also make a few. If he would keep his ears open for the rest of the session, he would hear a great deal about what is being done. The hon. member should save his speeches for a little later.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister is doing is confirming my basic point that the government, in the year 1956, is finally getting around to doing something on that issue.

Would the hon. Minister please sit down? He will have plenty of time to speak afterwards, if he wishes.

The government is getting around now to doing something, in the face of the conclusion in the Kennedy Report, that we are within sight of the destruction of our lumber resources, and in the face of the conclusion in the "White Paper," which states that we are within 20 years of the peak, and the beginning of the decline of our pulpwood resources.

If that is not a betrayal of trust to look after the resources of this province, I do not know what is. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is good the government is bringing this in. There should be 10 or 15 more Bills brought in, but up to now, as all hon. members know, the department is crawling at a time when it should be, not walking, but running, if we are going to save the resources of this province.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: There is some truth in what the hon. member says, but we are doing something about it.

MR. MacDONALD: Very belatedly.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: There are other things in connection with The Department of Lands and Forests about which the hon. member is not familiar. The Kennedy Report is a document the same as made by any royal commission, and I do not know of any royal commission's report in Ontario or even the Dominion of Canada which was ever implemented in its entirety. The hon. member cannot show me one.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: The government I represent, I feel, has done more to implement the report than was ever accomplished before.

MR. MacDONALD: That is not the case. I am sorry, but that is not the case.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: All right. There are a number of things about which the hon. member for York South has been talking when going around the province, and I do not think the hon. member has been too well informed about them. I have copies of the speeches the hon. member has made. I took pains to have them, because I knew this question might be raised in the House.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. Minister show me where I was inaccurate?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I have a report prepared by my predecessor, hon. Welland Gemmell, presented in the form of a "White Paper," from which the hon. member for York South was quoting, but he stopped too soon. If he had continued on, he would have learned what The Department of Lands and Forests has done, and contemplates doing in the future. Those things have been pointed out to management, and I can assure the hon. members it is the desire of our department to implement the recommendations, as far as we can.

That "White Paper" was prepared about two years ago. Since it was brought in, we have had conferences with industry, and have pointed out to them what they should do. We do not stand with a whip over their heads, but we try to get their co-operation and I am sure a government headed by the hon. member for York South would not be able to secure the same co-operation as this government.

We are trying to get on with doing a good job, and we shall continue to make every effort to do so.

Furthermore, it will be seen that at the proper time, we have implemented certain parts of the Kennedy Report. We have done it on a step-by-step basis. As the hon. members will agree, there are only certain things we can do within a certain time. I think we have done a good job, and it is up to the hon. member for York South to prove that we have not.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker; the hon. member has been going around the country talking about many things concerning which he is not too familiar, and I would invite him to come over to the department and consult with our officials, and we will be very glad to explain to him in detail what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions to ask the hon. member for York South. They are a little personal.

MR. MacDONALD: Good. Did the hon. Minister say they were a "little personal"?

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: Good.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: One concerns a statement made by the hon. member at Cobalt, in which he said:

Two of our northern Ministers are former employees on leave of absence from the pulp and paper companies. Is this the reason why public interest has to play "second fiddle" to private profits of these companies?

Did the hon. member make that statement?

MR. MacDONALD: I did, and I will say it again.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: That is wholly untrue. I would ask the hon. member to retract that.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I will not retract it, because in many cases the policies of various governments have been delayed for years in their implementation, because there is undue influence exerted on the part of the corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York South will have to accept the word of the hon. Minister.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: I resigned from my position when I entered the Cabinet, because I did not want to be under the jurisdiction of any paper company, and I think I showed a considerable amount of intestinal fortitude by doing so. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe I have done more for industry, and more for the people working in it, than any other Minister who has ever been in this position.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister considers it a personal affront, I am glad to retract that portion of it, but my general proposition is that time, time and time again, policies which should have been brought down and become part of public policy have been delayed for years because of the influence of the big corporations.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member either retracts or he does not. There are no "ifs" and "buts" about it.

MR. MacDONALD: I am retracting, insofar as the hon. Minister said he was not under the thumb of industry, but I shall never retract what I have said that the policies of the governments, here and at Ottawa, are unduly influenced by large corporations.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is not the issue.

MR. MacDONALD: We went through considerable debate in this House just the other day, when 95 people became flagrant free enterprisers, because of a few people who wanted to build a pipe line in this country, and—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. MR. PORTER: What Bill is the hon. member discussing now?

MR. MacDONALD: This Bill, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York South is imputing false motives, and he must not continue in that fashion.

I would like to say that we have allowed a great deal of latitude in these debates, which I think is "all to the good," but if we are going to continue ranging all over the field, we will have to apply the rules of the House, and each hon. member be allowed to speak but once in a debate.

MR. MacDONALD: I have a question to put to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: This Bill will accomplish a great deal of good work, Mr. Speaker, and I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

HON. L. P. CECILE (Minister of Public Welfare): This Twenty-fifth Parliament is the third headed by hon. Prime Minister Leslie Frost. This time in our history will undoubtedly be referred to as one of the greatest periods of progress which this province has ever witnessed. Ontario's first Parliament, which commenced the chain of legislative assemblies of which we are a part, opened on December 27, 1867.

It was headed by an illustrious Canadian of Scottish descent, Sir John Sandfield Macdonald. That great father of Confederation, Sir John A. Macdonald, was, of course, Prime Minister of Canada at the time. The Scottish people have indeed made an indelible impression upon the government of this country and this province. You know, I am sure, that hon. Leslie Frost is of Scottish descent. He, too, has those qualities of leadership which have contributed so much to the development of our province since the establishment of confederation.

In his play, *What Every Woman Knows*, Sir James M. Barrie has one

of his characters make this statement, which I believe applies so well to our present Prime Minister:

You have forgotten the grandest moral attribute of a Scotsman . . . that he'll do nothing which will damage his career.

I have been a member of this hon. House since 1948, and I have never had the opportunity of speaking to you as a private member. I would like therefore, for a few moments, to step out, as it were, of my position as a Cabinet Minister, so that I may speak on a subject which, I know you will understand, would be closest to me personally.

We all know of the great pride the Scotsman has in his homeland; how this is reflected even in descendants of several generations. We have many examples of this among the many members of this House.

All nationalities have, of course, made notable contributions to the growth and development of this land, and not the least of these have been my own people. Those of us who are of French descent can, I believe, take justifiable pride in our heritage of accomplishment for this country. People of French origin place great emphasis on the family as the primary unit of our civilization. This is a noble characteristic because it makes for stability, acceptance of mutual responsibility, and on the whole assures wholesome community life.

The French family is traditionally a happy family, with great capacity for enduring hardships when they occur.

People of all racial origins have brought to this country their own distinctive attributes which have been blended into our culture. I have mentioned my friends, the Scots, particularly, not only because of their many fine characteristics, but because of their historical relationship with the French people. I rather like that part of the story of Joan of Arc, which tells of how she led her army to the accompaniment of the strains of the bagpipes.

Nevertheless, whatever our racial origin has been, we are all Canadians



and we all have a deep and abiding love for our country. We are all concerned in building a greater Canada, and a greater Ontario. We have much at stake, not only in recognition of what our pioneers have endured to build so well, but particularly for the future—our children's future.

In my opening remarks, I referred to the first Parliament of Ontario, and in comparing its composition with the present House, some remarkable changes are to be observed.

That great nesting centre of Ontario, comprised of the Counties of Glengarry, Stormont, Prescott and Russell, was represented by 5 members in the first Parliament. They were Messrs. Macdonald, Calhoun, James Craig, William Craig, and James Boyd—the last-named being the first member to be elected by the voters of my own County of Prescott.

The area now comprised of Metropolitan Toronto and the Yorks was also represented by 5 members, in place of the 20 now serving the electors there. This, in itself, clearly reflects the great influx of population to the central part of Ontario.

It is interesting to note that the original 5 members elected to represent my area and that easterly portion of the province were all of Scottish descent. There has been throughout the years, of course, a transformation in the racial origin of people in that section. Undoubtedly, however, there would have been many French-speaking people living in those 5 eastern counties at the time of the first Parliament, and I am sure they received representation through their Scottish members.

I should add the Canada's first census in 1871 revealed that 75,383 persons in Ontario were stated to be of French racial origin; while in 1951, this number had increased to 477,677 persons, nearly half a million.

It was during the Ninth Parliament of Ontario, in 1904, that the first member of French descent was appointed as a Minister, serving without portfolio. This was Mr. Alfred Eventurel, and I

am pleased to say he represented the same constituency as myself. In 1905, when Sir James Whitney was Prime Minister, Dr. Joseph O. Reaume was appointed to the portfolio of Public Works. Dr. Reaume served until his retirement in 1914.

The next French Canadian Cabinet Minister was Dr. Paul Poisson, who was appointed by the hon. George Henry, and served without portfolio during the lifetime of that government. Dr. Poisson served in both wars with distinction, and is still taking a leading interest in community affairs in the Windsor area.

By the way, both Dr. Reaume and Dr. Poisson came from Windsor and district. As most of you know, this is the area in which I was born and raised and I am still very proud of it. Only two other Ministers of French descent, apart from myself, have served in Cabinet posts in Ontario. They were Paul Leduc, who was Minister of Mines, and he was succeeded by Robert Laurier. Both of these men came from Ottawa.

Thus, during these 89 years since Confederation, and 25 Parliaments, 6 Canadians of French descent, including myself, have served as members of Ontario governments.

Edmund Burke has said: "People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors." I felt this backward look which I have reviewed here for you might serve to reassure us that we have a strong foundation upon which we can continue to build for the future of this province and our country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in this House relating to The Department of Reform Institutions. I would like to describe an incident which happened to me personally a few days before last Christmas.

I was proceeding west from my Town of Hawkesbury, and I noticed a young lad standing at the side of the road, obviously hoping to get a lift. I stopped and asked him to jump into the car. Our conversation drifted to the question as to where he lived, and he replied that he was now residing in the City of

Montreal. He said he would appreciate being let out at Alfred.

Well, our discussion continued, and the boy told me he was going to the St. Joseph's Training School for a visit. You will know that this is one of the training schools coming under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) and is operated by the Christian Brothers.

The lad revealed that he had spent 3 years at this training school, obviously at the request of the court. Now he was returning for a visit—this time voluntarily—so that he might enjoy his Christmas with those who had given him kindly treatment and guidance through what undoubtedly had been a most trying period of his young life.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of credit should be given to those who work in that difficult field of reform, when young men such as the one I have mentioned, look upon their training school experience in such a wholesome manner.

May I also touch briefly on another phase of education—that of higher education—being provided, for example, by the University of Ottawa. This government, led by hon. Leslie Frost, is a progressive one. We are aware of the necessary functions of universities, and as you all know, we are extending every effort to provide for additional educational facilities. The University of Ottawa rates very high indeed, in the educational world, and the Provincial Government has been giving every encouragement, financially and otherwise, in the development of this university. May I wish the University of Ottawa continued success in the outstanding work being done there.

I would like now to refer to a few matters concerning my own department. I have had occasion to consider much of the legislation as it relates to public welfare. As you know, several of our Acts are ones sponsored primarily by the Government of Canada. That is, under these shareable programmes, we may render assistance to certain groups of persons, providing the conditions laid

down by the Federal Government are met.

I need not remind the members of this House that the conditions are exceedingly detailed, requiring strict interpretation and, to say the least, at times most frustrating. Unlike the Federal Government system to the south of us, where much latitude is given to the individual states, the Canadian provinces are virtually without any discretion in administering the joint programmes, except that the provinces can make the conditions more restrictive if they so desire.

I think I do not need to say that in Ontario we have availed ourselves of every limit the Federal Government will allow.

You will know, of course, that the Government of Canada has no objection to giving discretion to the provinces in the matter of granting additional assistance to recipients over and above the rates set by federal legislation. But the Federal Government has steadfastly refused to share in the provision of such additional assistance, despite the fact that these are programmes with joint financial responsibility. Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding on this matter. The standards established to provide for the blind, the disabled, and in old-age assistance, are those designed by the Government of Canada; and even in these, they are inconsistent, when one programme is compared with the others.

Take, for example, the matter of allowable income. In old-age assistance and disabled persons' allowances, an applicant and spouse are permitted to have \$1,200 per year, including the amount of allowance granted. In blind persons' allowances a married applicant living with a sighted spouse may have a total income of \$1,560 per year, including the allowance; while the amount permitted for a married applicant, living with a blind spouse, is \$1,680 yearly.

A further comparison may be made with a programme administered entirely by the Government of Canada. I refer to war veterans' allowances. The allowable income for a married veteran and spouse is \$1,440 per year. I am sure

you will agree that this is quite a variety in income limits. To highlight the effect of these differences, we have only to note that in the programme for the blind, married recipients may have \$30 to \$40 additional monthly income, over those persons coming under disabled persons' allowances and old age assistance. I would ask my federal friends, are not these people just as needy as those who are blind?

Another source of constant irritation in the administration of the federal-provincial programmes is the federal regulation requiring us to charge 5 per cent. of the assessed value of property owned by our recipients, as income to them. As a matter of fact, this 5 per cent. charge must be made on the person who may still be in the process of acquiring his home, and meeting mortgage payments.

The explanation we are given for this procedure is that the federal authorities regard the person who is renting property as being in an unfavourable position, as over against the person who owns his own home. However, does not this income charge upon the property owner have the effect of penalizing thrift? Rather than penalize such a person, should we not recognize the efforts he has made to provide a permanent roof over his head?

There is another problem with particular reference to old-age assistance. We are required to utilize an artificial method of assessing savings and other assets in the possession of applicants. For example, an unmarried person who has \$2,200 in savings, and no other source of income, applies at age 65 years, and could qualify for the maximum rate of \$40 per month. However, if that same person were to apply at age 68, he could qualify for only \$10 per month.

All these conditions are commonly known as the means test. Even in the examples I have given, you can see the complications; and when the circumstances of recipients alter in any way, while they are receiving these allowances, they may be faced with overpayments, which we are required to recover from them. I would ask how

such overpayments can be avoided in many instances, when you consider the stringent, detailed qualifications for the granting of assistance?

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken frankly, as you would wish me to do, in describing some of the problems which relate to the granting of aid to our Canadian people. I can say with assurance that, in the programmes sponsored by the Government of Canada and administered by the province, we shall provide financial assistance to the limit which any future changes in their legislation may allow. I should add, though, that this will be contingent on the Federal Government's willingness to share the costs equally with the province, without levying their share of responsibility upon Ontario.

I am pleased to say that we are now embarking on a rehabilitation programme for handicapped persons, in partnership with the Government of Canada. We are endeavouring to proceed ahead with this scheme, despite the fact that the Federal Government will not contribute to the cost of medical services for these persons, or to the cost of supplying artificial limbs or other prosthetic appliances, where these are required.

In this latter connection, we are planning to continue our relationship with the municipalities. May I emphasize at this point that, again, the federally-sponsored programme is a limited one. Providing we request our Department of Education to submit accounts for vocational training services rendered to handicapped persons, we may recover 50 per cent. of the costs of such training and maintenance, if the cases are approved by the federal authorities.

A very loosely-knit organization exists at the federal level with reference to rehabilitation. In Ontario, however, we have much hope that we may be able to provide certain rehabilitation services to handicapped persons, so that they may be able to accept employment. We are taking all necessary steps towards this end, for those who may qualify for training and placement.



Mr. Speaker, in Ontario we are most fortunate in being blessed with prosperous times. Our people are producers. Opportunities for employment have been made available to many who were previously regarded as marginally employable. Recently, the Prudential Insurance Company of America raised the retirement age for their staff from 65 to 68 years.

In expressing satisfaction over this progressive step, I stated that because of the establishment of an arbitrary retirement age, there has been a very great waste of human talent and effort. Capable persons are often discarded at times when they have much to offer. I believe that industry, business, and government should again re-examine their compulsory retirement policies.

We are all aware of the fine advances being made by medical science and of the extraordinary gifts and stability of many older people. We should encourage them to continue their services, wherever possible, so that they may contribute their skills and experience to their chosen areas of work. I am suggesting, at least, that no automatic actuarial scheme should treat the older worker in an arbitrary manner. We need the productive capacities of our older citizens, where they are prepared and capable of continuing their employment.

In closing, I should note that we are making it possible for additional needy cases to receive assistance under an amendment to The Mothers' Allowances Act, which is before the House. Provincial expenditures under our Homes for the Aged legislation, are increasing due to the excellent response to this programme on the part of municipalities.

We have taken a decidedly progressive step in expanding our services to include assistance for Indians and their families, subject to the same qualifications for aid applying to all citizens of this province. I have mentioned our developing rehabilitation programme, and our sincere desire to return to gainful employment, as many handicapped persons as possible. We are endeavouring to take a realistic ap-

proach in the expansion of our services, and to ensure a constant source of income to long-term needy cases. These measures will further relieve municipalities of financial commitments.

I would like to mention here, that one of Ontario's most notable organizations is again looking to the public for support. I refer to the Victorian Order of Nurses. We all know of the very fine services being rendered by this group. They work so efficiently and quietly among our people, that sometimes we fail to appreciate just how effective and necessary their services are, in the various communities throughout Ontario.

No doubt you will know that we, as a government, are recognizing this splendid organization, and that we are supporting them with an annual grant of \$80,000. I am hopeful that this recognition of the nursing services being made available to all people, including the needy, will stimulate the interest of the public at large, to lend their support to this essential work.

The members of this House know, that they have an open door to my department. There can be no question as to the willingness of all the members of my staff, from the Deputy Minister to the directors of the various branches; the members of the field staff and others, to co-operate fully in the work of human betterment of all our people.

MR. G. J. MONAGHAN (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker: The voice of northern Ontario was heard strong and clear at the dawn of this session when the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne eloquently proclaimed the great achievements of this government. His voice rang out after another northerner like ourselves—at least a southeast northerner—so tellingly launched the debate.

It is therefore with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I want to say through you, to both the original speakers, how much I enjoyed listening to them, and how much more I understand our great province and the role

our government is playing toward the inspiring future that lies ahead.

But before I proceed with the sum and substance of my remarks, may I, sir, tell you that I am happy to see how well you have taken to your new responsibilities as Speaker of this House.

Your long experience, your sagacity, your sense of fairness, and above all, your deep-rooted sense of duty, assure us that the business of this Legislature is in good hands for many years to come.

As a newcomer to this House, I hope that my efforts will be of value to my constituency, our province and our country. I am conscious of the great responsibilities that are part and parcel of my new position as member for Sudbury in the Legislature of Ontario. That feeling, I know is general in this House, no matter where we may be seated, and no matter the colour of our political standard.

I have mentioned these feelings, Mr. Speaker, because in my opening remarks I wished to say to this House that I am happy to be here with all of you, and I pray to God that this original feeling will stay with me during my stay in provincial affairs.

The Speech from the Throne is a document of great significance. I had the honour and pleasure of hearing it read. I have since gone over it a few times. It contains a vast amount of information in its few pages. It conveys the idea that we are going ahead at such a fantastic speed that even just over one decade after the thought-provoking explosion of the atom bomb at Hiroshima, we are now on the verge of harnessing atomic energy to the more peaceful requirements of a province on the move.

My riding, Mr. Speaker, lies but a few miles from the great Blind River uranium field. This, in the opinion of experts, is by far the greatest potential source of atomic energy in the world. That this new source of power is situated in northern Ontario, and that also a large amount of the new power demand will stem from developments in northern Ontario, causes me to suggest,

sir, that the time has arrived when more of our attention in this House should be concerned with some of the more pressing problems of northern Ontario.

Much has been accomplished in my riding through the efforts of this government. This is especially true with regard to roads, hospitals and schools. However, I cannot repeat too often that the requirements of northern Ontario are far from having been satisfied and that much more must be done by the province to bring about a more acceptable state of affairs.

Northern Ontario, for so many long years, has been relegated to the position of an unwanted step-child, and for that reason much of the work that should have been gradually done over the years must now be accomplished in one major stroke.

I am well aware of the deep interest of the hon. Prime Minister in northern Ontario. He has given us confirmation of that interest by having two members from northern constituencies appointed to the Cabinet. I also know that a great many hon. members realize that the continued forward march of Ontario as a whole is predicated upon the rational development of the vast storehouse of natural resources of northern Ontario.

Access and development roads are a primary need. When populations follow in the wake of a mining discovery or the establishment of a new forest industry, then better roads are required, schools, hospitals, police protection and the full complement of the necessities that go with the standard of living we in Canada deserve.

We are making some progress in the first two types of roads mentioned. The development of new mines throughout northern Ontario can be attributed to the foresight of this government and the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) in spending public funds for the purpose of encouraging this type of development.

More heartening still is the recent announcement of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Mapledoram) that the whole question of forest development roads was under review by a

special committee composed of representatives of his department, industry, and a member of his advisory committee.

There has been a crying need in the north for a positive policy on such roads, and the government should be congratulated for having taken the bull by the horns to settle this question once and for all.

We should all bear in mind that each new mile of road we build opens up vast avenues of welcome to the increasing number of tourists, both Canadian and American, and that the more tourists we get here, the better it is all around.

Up in northern Ontario, we have literally a few hundred thousand square miles of potential tourist areas that can be reached only by a comparatively few visitors; and the reason for this is that we have not enough roads to service the requirements of the large number of people who are ready and willing to spend vacation dollars here.

While on the subject of roads and recreation, may I point out, sir, that the people of Sudbury—who are living in the very midst of a vacation paradise—find it just as difficult to locate a picnic spot on a week-end as the people of southern Ontario. Lack of access, in our case, is the trouble. I view with considerable relief the new parks policy of the government, and I feel assured that The Department of Lands and Forests are pressing on with their determination to create sufficient public parks in suitable sites across the full breadth of the province.

In this particular respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we find here further evidence of the government's concern with the welfare of the people of the province, and in this and other similar efforts, it should be congratulated and encouraged to carry on.

Just a few seconds ago, I mentioned the fact that Sudbury was located in the midst of a vacation paradise. It dawns on me, Mr. Speaker, that there are probably quite a few hon. members who have yet to see the awe-inspiring sight of

Sudbury. So, if I may for a few moments digress from the intended tenor of my contribution to this debate, I would like to say to those among the representation that nowhere in this province—all proportions kept in mind—does there exist a richer, more progressive, a more interesting collectivity of human beings than can be found in Sudbury.

Let me give you a thumb-nail sketch of what I mean:

There are more motor vehicles per capita in Sudbury than anywhere else in Canada.

We have, in Sudbury, more ethnic groups than any other place in Canada, including the riding of my good friend the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman).

The take-home pay of Sudbury wage-earners is well above that of those of any other community of comparable size in all of Canada.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have in Sudbury more problems of a municipal order than any other municipality of its size in Canada.

All these points I have brought up were not just the products of chance. They are the net result of the discovery of the richest metal deposits in the world. These rich nickel-copper mines of the Sudbury basin, which are the mainstay of Sudbury proper, and a growing number of adjacent municipalities, have been in production since 1885. They have contributed new wealth in the billions.

It is unfortunate that The Department of Planning and Development did not exist in those early days, otherwise we would have very little to worry about at the level of municipal government. Sudbury would be the most beautiful city in Ontario; it would have plenty of room in which to move; there would be no necessity of drilling and blasting through the hardest rock in the world to establish water and sewer facilities; and finally, Mr. Speaker, the question of amalgamation would not be staring us in the face.



Who would not be proud of the beautiful municipal developments now taking place at Atikokan, at Manitouwadge, at Elliott Lake and in the new uranium development in Haliburton?

Today, we are faced in Sudbury proper with a population of 50,000 people, hemmed in by rocky ridges that spell the limits of our political borders. Beyond those rocky ridges, and in more open country, other municipalities have developed, and in recent years grown to a point where their populations far exceed that of Sudbury proper.

Owing to the uncontrolled and fantastic growth of Sudbury proper, and the adjacent municipalities, the improper use of the watershed to take care of our requirements for water supply and sewage disposal has brought us in the presence of a pollution problem whose solution lies in the immediate amalgamation of these municipalities or at least the achievement of some form of understanding that will put an end to the impossible conditions under which we are living.

This particular issue is one which, I feel, I can talk on with some degree of authority, having been associated with it in my capacity both as alderman and controller of the City of Sudbury for the past 5 years.

I recall spending unending hours in fruitless discussion of this vast question. Finally we decided, along with our neighbouring municipalities, to call in expert advisers from the senior government. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the very day we made application to Mr. Frost, and the members of his Cabinet, their experts were instructed to proceed immediately with an exhaustive survey of the problem in accordance with our request.

This incidentally took place on January 19 of this year, and I was there!

I must emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the people of my riding, and for that matter all the people of this great province that is bursting at the seams, are awaiting with great anticipation the

results of this survey. If the survey is successful and produces an acceptable and satisfactory solution, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here at last we would have a working pattern to apply to innumerable other centres of growth in this province where comparable conditions exist. No doubt Sudbury will be one of the first municipalities on the agenda for the proposed new water and sewage commission survey.

It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to cover a great many points brought up in the Speech from the Throne, or subjects which had been inspired by this great document, but I realize that there are more limitations to time than there are to imagination.

Among these subjects which I hope to be able to discuss later on this session are matters affecting education, health, civilian defence, conservation, high Hydro rates affecting northern Ontario, and the great need for immediate approval of a new court house, and other new buildings in my riding.

But in view of the fact that I am coming to the end of my commentary I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the last paragraph in the Speech from the Throne warrants an observation from this speaker which varies somewhat from the implication therein contained.

May I, sir, quote that paragraph?

It says:

Gratitude is expressed to the civil servants of Ontario for their industry and faithful discharge of their duties and responsibilities. The reduced turnover in civil servants reflects improved conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the statistics of the turnover may impress some people but they leave me cold. In my experience in public affairs I have learned to become wary of statistics. But, in public affairs, I have found out that all of my most sincere efforts, and those of my colleagues, were as good as those of the civil servants who backed us up. They have the technical knowledge along with the determination to loyally support the

men who have been elected to fix policy. And we all know here that policy is a word respected by our civil servants.

What puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, is that the Province of Ontario is the biggest business in the province, bar none. And yet, we search across the 7 seas for talented employees, technical or otherwise, and sometimes we get them. They come to us feeling that in our midst they shall find surcease from their personal problems. We offer them a pittance which they accept until such time as they prove themselves acceptable to others. The latter are only too willing to up the ante and therefore rob us of the prizes that we thought were securely contained within the *aegis* of our civil service.

Most of our losses can be attributed to the fact that we pay less for an even effort, or an equal capacity, than the nearest competition.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal has been accomplished by this administration in the matter of civil service pay. I have no doubt that we are doing something at the moment to further improve the situation. But I still believe that we are not ready to think like industry in the matter of pay. And for that reason we are losing key personnel, and we are failing in our efforts to attract replacements or personnel of the proper calibre for new positions. I beseech the administration to reconsider the whole question of salaries in the light of the inroads of private industry on the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the government on their approval of the trans-Canada pipe line. In order to give you an idea of how the elected representatives of my riding have supported this project I would like to read to the House some wires I received immediately prior to the taking of the vote on Wednesday last. The first wire is from the Township of McKim:

The township of McKim respectfully requests you to petition your government to service this area of

northern Ontario by the trans-Canada pipe line project. You are well aware of the great potential wealth that is in this district. The supplying of natural gas will open up industries that will add greatly to the economic wealth of the province.

The next wire is from Mayor Landreville and it reads:

Our city begs you to make strong representation to your government that this area of northern Ontario be serviced by trans-Canada pipe line project. Urge you to strongly underline that the potential development of industry here is this economical source of power it supplies.

The last sentence I was especially pleased with:

Speak without fear of contradiction that the land of the future is northern Ontario.

MR. NIXON: May I ask has Sudbury been given its local franchise?

MR. MONAGHAN: Not yet, it is under consideration at the present time.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say with profound humility that I am here today because of the untimely death of one of the greatest representatives the people of Ontario ever had in this House. If the late hon. Welland Gemmell had not been taken away from us so early in life, I know that I would not be here today.

Hon. Welland Gemmell, during his short, but extraordinarily active career, was an inspiration to all who knew him. I knew him well. I admired him; and I shall always remember him for the great man he was. To attempt to fill the vacancy created by his death is no easy task, but I am determined to do the best I can.

Mr. Speaker, although the people of northern Ontario appear at times to be jealous of their prerogatives, I wish to assure the hon. members that they are just as enthusiastic about the great

forward strides this province is making as are the residents of other sections of Ontario. They feel that they are playing a major role in our expansion and they are proud of it. And so, Mr. Speaker, they join all of their fellow Ontarians in proclaiming that this province should go on forward—ever forward, but they would like to add: "Forward—through northern Ontario."

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I wish to announce that on Monday we shall deal with items on the Order paper, and then continue with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.10 of the clock, p.m.





# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Monday, February 27, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Monday, February 27, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| First report, Standing Committee on Conservation, Mr. Stewart .....   | 511 |
| Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953, Bill to amend,<br>Mr. Goodfellow, first reading .....                                 | 511 |
| Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, Bill to amend,<br>Mr. Goodfellow, first reading .....                           | 511 |
| Presentation of report, Mr. Dunbar .....  | 513 |
| Sarnia General Hospital, Bill respecting, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Canada Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America,<br>Bill respecting, third reading .....             | 513 |
| City of Peterborough, Bill respecting, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Bill respecting, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Board of Education for the City of Hamilton, Bill respecting, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Protestant Home of St. Catharines, Bill respecting, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Entry of Horses at Exhibitions Act, Bill to repeal, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Department of Education Act, 1954, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Separate Schools Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Municipal Arbitrations Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Public Schools Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, Bill to establish, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Territorial Division Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 513 |
| Seed Potatoes Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Ontario Food Terminal Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Farm Products Marketing Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Co-operative Loans Act, 1956, Bill intituled, third reading .....   | 513 |
| Regulations Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....   | 513 |
| Trustee Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....   | 514 |
| Securities Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading .....  | 514 |
| Use of Pesticides, Bill to regulate, Mr. Phillips, second reading .....   | 514 |
| Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, second reading .....   | 514 |
| Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954, Bill to amend, Mr. Griesinger, second reading .....                                       | 514 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 514 |
| Town of Leaside, Bill respecting, reported .....  | 515 |
| Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District,<br>Bill respecting, reported .....                    | 515 |
| City of Niagara Falls, Bill respecting, reported .....  | 515 |
| Mining Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 515 |
| Public Service Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 516 |
| Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 516 |
| Railway Fire Charge Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 516 |
| Crown Timber Act, 1952, Bill to amend, held .....   | 516 |
| Resumption of debate on the Speech from the Throne,<br>Mr. Lewis, Mr. Spence, Mr. Fishleigh, Mr. Thomas (Oshawa), Mr. Worton .. | 517 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lavergne, agreed to .....   | 549 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 549 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. W. J. Stewart from the Standing Committee on Conservation presented the committee's first report and moves its adoption.

"The committee held two meetings, on February 20 and 27. Mr. Stewart was elected chairman. Officials of The Department of Planning and Development and of The Department of Lands and Forests explained the operations of their departments as they pertained to conservation.

"The following resolutions were approved:

"That the committee commends both the Federal and Provincial Governments for the work they have been doing in controlling that great menace to commercial fishing, the sea lamprey, and urged that this work should be intensified and carried to completion.

"That pulp and paper companies and other wood processing plants and users of wood be asked to intensify their efforts to find the means to salvage a great percentage of our raw forest

products now being lost in valuable waste which in turn is polluting our waters.

"The work of the committee is continuing.

"Respectfully submitted.

(signed) W. J. STEWART,  
Chairman"

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES ADJUSTMENT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is only one change in this Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, that is, to bring it into line with The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act of 1953.

### THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hon. Mr. Goodfellow moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.



He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains 25 suggested amendments to The Metropolitan Toronto Act which was introduced in this House nearly 3 years ago, and which established the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, consisting of Toronto and the suburban municipalities. It has been felt advisable up to the present time that the municipality should function as provided in the Bill originally establishing it in 1953.

However, at this time, after two full years of operation with great success and advantage to this great metropolitan area, it is thought advisable that certain amendments should be placed before the House, in order to provide what is thought would provide more efficient administration of its affairs.

Mr. Speaker, on second reading, I propose to go into the various sections and the principles involved therein. At the present time, the sections which would probably be of most interest to hon. members, particularly those representing the Toronto and York ridings, are as follows:

We have provided in this Bill for a mandatory two-year term for the councils for all the municipalities in the Metropolitan area. We are providing also for a unification of the police forces of the 13 municipalities. We are providing for the establishment of a police commission, for a licencing board, not only for Metropolitan Toronto but for the individual municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other provisions which are necessary, in our opinion, having given these matters a good deal of study and having worked closely with the officials of Metropolitan Toronto, who have had experience in administering the affairs in the past two years.

Mr. Speaker, all these suggestions have come forward from the Metropolitan Council, who have recommended they be incorporated into The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Minister a question? Is there any

amendment among these 25 which are proposed to resolve the overlapping jurisdiction in the matter of conservation?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, there is a proposed amendment dealing with conservation, but I am not sure that is the one to which the hon. member for York South refers.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, some one prompts me that we have a Bill on that, but that Bill does not resolve any of the matters of overlapping jurisdiction, between the powers given to the Metropolitan municipality when established 3 years ago, the powers under the old conservation authorities, and the new composite one just established.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that either in the Conservation Bill or in this one, there should be some resolving of this overlapping jurisdiction. We may be dealing with this matter later in connection with the conservation Bill, but at the present time this is one factor bedevilling the work of the conservation authorities more than anything else.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that matters dealing with conservation, which actually affect an area much broader than Metropolitan Toronto, might properly come within the conservation Bill before the House. We have had no request from Metropolitan Toronto in connection with any matter dealing with conservation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I have a question to ask of the government, as follows:

In view of the fact that this is the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Victoria Cross and inasmuch as the Federal Government has offered to pay the travelling expenses of the various Victoria Cross winners to England for the celebrations to be held this coming

summer, would this government give any consideration to paying the expenses of these gallant gentlemen, and their wives, while they are overseas?

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, as soon as it was brought to my attention that an expedition was planned for those holding the Victoria Cross to travel to the Old Country next summer to assist in celebrating the 100th anniversary of that Order, I immediately made provision for a further contribution to the holders of the Victoria Cross who reside in Ontario, towards their expenses, over and above the travelling expenses, and also providing for an additional amount for the wives of holders of the Victoria Cross who might be accompanying them. Provision has been made in the Budget. As it is not usual to anticipate what is in the Budget, this has not been announced. That item will appear in the Budget and will be laid before this House in due course.

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Before the Orders of the day, may I answer a question which was asked on Friday by the hon. member for Brant? He asked how many Dominion-Provincial bursaries were awarded to students at the Ontario Agricultural college this year. The answer is 39, and in the Ontario Veterinary College, 29 students enjoy a Dominion-Provincial bursary.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario for the year 1955.

### THIRD READINGS

The following Bills were upon motion read a third time:

Bill No. 2, An Act respecting the Sarnia General Hospital.

Bill No. 6, An Act respecting the Canada Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America.

Bill No. 9, An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill No. 10, An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Bill No. 19, An Act respecting the Board of Education for the City of Hamilton.

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Protestant Home of St. Catharines.

Bill No. 40, An Act to repeal The Entry of Horses at Exhibitions Act.

Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1954.

Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Municipal Arbitrations Act.

Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 56, An Act to establish the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology.

Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Ontario Food Terminal Act.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act, 1952.

Bill No. 85, The Co-operative Loans Act, 1956.

Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

### THE REGULATIONS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend The Regulations Act."

He said: In introducing this Bill, I explained it is a very short amendment, and will exempt from the Regulations Act Orders-in-Council designating secondary development roads which will extend the exemption now applicable to King's Highways.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Trustee Act."

He said: This again is a Bill with one section amending The Trustee Act. It is designated to give protection to an administrator *ad litem* in his personal capacity from the effect of a judgment against him in his representative capacity.

Section 2(a) came into force on April 5, 1951, with a re-enactment made effective on the same date in order to give the desired protection in all cases.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend The Securities Act."

He said: On the introduction of this Bill, I gave a short description of the contents of the amending Act. This Bill will go to the Committee on Legal Bills. In the main, the amendments relate to certain exemptions now existing from registrations, requiring the Securities Commission to be given 10 days' notice before proceeding in the case of a sale of a company's issue to its own shareholders. A number of amending sections bring the financial statements which will be required by The Securities Commission, on the filing of the prospectuses, in line with the financial-statement requirements of The Corporations Act.

In committee this Bill will be dealt with in detail, and unless the House wants further explanation, I will content myself with the explanation I have given now.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## AN ACT TO REGULATE THE USE OF PESTICIDES

Hon. M. Phillips moves second reading of Bill No. 95, "An Act to regulate the use of pesticides."

He said: As I said on first reading, this Bill involves very few new principles, except to remove it from The Public Health Act, and incorporate it in a new Act. This Bill will go to the Committee on Health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

Hon. Mr. Phillips moves second reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act."

He said: This Bill will also go before the Committee on Health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT, 1954

Hon. W. Griesinger moves second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, 1954."

He said: When the Bill was introduced, Mr. Speaker, I stated there was no change in principle from the present Act. It is merely to distinguish and clarify the difference between "organized" and "unorganized" territory, and also to clarify the word "aid" and "grant" in both cases.

In the third section, hereafter the monies granted will be paid out of Estimates voted for the purpose by the Legislature, instead of being a statutory item.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of the Whole; Mr. Edwards in the Chair.



### THE TOWN OF LEASIDE

House in Committee on Bill No. 3,  
"An Act respecting the Town of  
Leaside."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

### THE CHATHAM BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE CHATHAM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

House in Committee on Bill No. 11,  
"An Act respecting the Chatham Board  
of Education and the Chatham Suburban  
High School District.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules "A", "B" and "C" agreed  
to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 11 reported.

### CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

House in Committee on Bill No. 13,  
"An Act respecting the City of Niagara  
Falls."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule "A" agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 13 reported.

### THE MINING ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 89,  
"An Act to amend The Mining Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4:

MR. R. GISBORN (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I am in support of section 4, but I feel the circumstances necessitating an amendment to the section are sufficient to warrant some discussion. It appears from information I have received that this amendment was thought necessary

because of an accident in a mine, which resulted in the death of a miner.

I want to impress upon hon. members than an industry such as mining requires laws and regulations in regard to the health of the miners. If an amendment to a section in regard to safety is necessary, after being in the rules and regulations for so many years, there must be something wrong, either with the lack of enforcement of the provisions, or basically, with the section in regard to a particular mine.

I do not want to discuss whether the inquest into the particular death was conducted properly or not. The point I would like to make is that, in regard to an industry as important as mining, with its hazards and conditions, the government or the hon. Minister of Mines should point out that when we have a section which has been incorporated in the Act for so many years regarding safety, it is not used in the legalistic sense, as just confining themselves to the basic minimums it might be interpreted to mean.

The people in the mining district where this fatality occurred were quite concerned with the manner in which the inquest was conducted, and that all the facts were not disclosed.

I am not going to argue that point. I think some other hon. members know more about it, but I think it should be pointed out very clearly to the mining industry by the inspectors that they should not apply a legalistic interpretation of some of the sections in the Act, but, because of the nature of the industry, they should give a broader interpretation, and give full scope to the intent of the section. I would like to hear something from the hon. Minister on that.

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I think the point that the hon. member is making is that the shaft sheeting was not, shall we say, plumb to the size of the cage operating within the shaft. This is a condition which has obtained over the 50 years, and which this Bill is correcting.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the other point is concerned, I may say that that matter has been referred to the hon. Attorney-General to deal with, with appropriate recommendations for prosecutions.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

Bill No. 89 reported.

### THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 75 reported.

### THE ONTARIO HIGHWAY TRANSPORT BOARD

House in Committee on Bill No. 50, "An Act to amend The Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 50 reported.

### THE RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 60, "An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act."

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 60 reported.

### THE CROWN TIMBER ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act, 1952."

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On section 9:

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the House that the new subsection 2 gives the hon. Minister very wide power. No matter how well we may think of the hon. Minister, he will not be here for all time, and we may not get another hon. Minister upon whom we

would look as favourably. Notwithstanding that, subsection 2 reads as follows:

2. Notwithstanding subsection 1, the Minister may sell, lease or otherwise dispose of land within a provincial forest for any purpose that is not inconsistent with the purpose of such forest, or where it is deemed expedient to establish a town site within a provincial forest . . .

Later on, it is suggested that he may have power to sell such land for a town site. No one will suggest that the hon. Minister should not have power to dispose of some of the land for town sites; but I suggest that where he is given power to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of land, that power could be used in a dictatorial way by a Minister. It is a power which should not be vested in him by a Bill of this kind, certainly not without reference to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister who has authority on these matters, and who usually deals with them very carefully, that in this section the hon. Minister is being given almost unlimited power, which he would not necessarily need for the disposition of such things as are intended in the Act itself.

HON. C. E. MAPLEDORAM (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the only reason for the section is in relation to provincial forests. The old Provincial Forests Act and The Crown Timber Act of 1952 did not clarify The Provincial Parks Act. There were a number of instances where we would like to do something by virtue of The Provincial Parks Act, in relation to town sites or summer resorts, but over which we had no power.

The general rule is that provincial forests will remain as such for the development of timber only, and in connection with developments where we want a town or a provincial park, matters arise which make it necessary for us to have such powers, and that is the reason they are put in this Bill.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I have said previously that there would be no opposition to the hon. Minister disposing of part of this land for a town site. But the words I am objecting to are "the sale, lease or otherwise disposing of land." I suggest to the hon. Minister these powers are altogether too wide, and he should not ask to have the right to exercise them except by way of an Order-in-Council.

No hon. Minister, I suggest, should want those powers. In fact, they are opposed to the intention of the Bill, which is to conserve. In this instance, the hon. Minister is given the widest possible latitude to "sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any of these lands," as he wishes, for almost any conceivable purpose. I suggest to the House that these powers are altogether too wide.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the addition of the words which the hon. leader of the Opposition suggests. As a matter of fact, it might appear to be proper, and to be good sense, that the words should be inserted. These parks might comprise areas of very considerable extent, and be of considerable value. Perhaps it would be a protection all around.

Therefore, I would suggest that we hold that section until a proper amendment can be prepared. I assume the amendment will be a simple one, simply saying that the Minister may, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, carry out the functions described in the Bill.

I presume that would meet the situation, but I think we had better withhold the Bill and let the law officers look at it. Otherwise, we might have to tidy it up on another occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this Bill be held over.

Bill No. 72 held.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the committee do now rise and report certain Bills without amendment and consideration of another Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. J. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendment, consideration of another Bill, moves the adoption of the report, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. W. B. LEWIS (York Humber): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to the many others who have preceded me, to you upon your appointment as hon. Speaker of this House. I can think of no one more admirably equipped to carry out the responsible duties, and your administration to date has borne out my contention.

Mr. Speaker, as I am about to formally address this House for the first time may I say how honoured I am to be a member of this Legislature.

This Legislature stands as one of a diminishing number of free governmental institutions, as Communism in the last 40 years has spread its tentacles into country after country with an immediate liquidation of their representative and responsible government. Fortunately that progress has been stayed in recent years.

On this continent free institutions have been preserved and although they differ in details it is by no accident that they all sprung from the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster.

Our system of government permits a member of this House to present to his colleagues the views of the people who in a free election have sent him here to represent them.

I am honoured at this time, Mr. Speaker, by being not only a member of this Legislature but also by being the reeve of the Township of Etobicoke, and a member of the council of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

As reeve of Etobicoke I represent one of the large and rapidly expanding



municipalities in the Metropolitan area, a municipality originally established in 1850 and from which was split off during the years 1911 to 1930 the Towns of Mimico and New Toronto and the Village of Long Branch.

The balance of Etobicoke remains intact; its population is now in excess of 100,000, and it is gradually balancing its assessment as between industrial and commercial as differentiated from residential, but has a long way to go still before it will reach the desired ratio of 50 per cent. of each. Etobicoke is an example of that miracle of suburbanization which has affected every large city on the North American Continent and has caused such a change in our way of life.

The fundamental cause of that change was the automobile. There are now over 53 million motor vehicles in the United States, over 5 million in Canada, over 1½ million in Ontario, and over ½ million in Metropolitan Toronto. That caraván of motor vehicles roaming near and far and always on the move has changed our whole economy and our whole way of existence. The suburban dweller is the result of that change, and it is my privilege to represent him in this Legislature and to present his views.

As the first member for the new constituency of York Humber, it is my honour to represent the Village of Swansea, part of the Township of York, the Town of Weston, the Town of Mimico, and part of Etobicoke.

On this level I represent Weston, one of the oldest settlements in Ontario founded on the lumber, milling, distilling and brewing industries. The original settlement kept itself far back from Lake Ontario to protect itself against invasion by the Iroquois Indians, who then occupied the south shore of Lake Ontario which is now New York State. In that riding is also part of the Township of York, the first municipality in the County of York established in 1793, when Governor Simcoe divided Upper Canada into 19 counties. That was long before the Town of York was incorporated in 1817 and later became the City of Toronto in 1834. Also in

that riding is the Village of Swansea, the second youngest of all the Metropolitan municipalities, having been established in 1925. The municipalities which I have indicated are all suburban municipalities of greater or less degree.

As a member of the council of Metropolitan Toronto, I have the honour to represent with my other 24 colleagues the 1,300,000 people who live in the Metropolitan area, which is the most rapidly expanding industrial, commercial and residential area in this country and second only to Los Angeles on the whole of the continent.

I am pleased to enter this 25th Parliament of the Province of Ontario at a time when the province is enjoying its greatest period of expansion and its most prosperous period of development. In this respect, may I respectfully add my compliments to the hon. Prime Minister of this province for his most excellent and comprehensive submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects.

A study of that brief permits one, in very brief and capsule form, to recognize the importance of the position of this province in the Dominion of Canada.

Ever since Confederation, Ontario has had ⅓ of the population and 37 per cent. of the labour force of the Dominion. The population now is 5¼ million and will exceed 6 million in the early 1960's. Births are approximately 140,000 a year and immigration has accounted for over 630,000 in the last 10 years for an average of 63,000 a year.

Over half of all manufactured products in Canada are produced in Ontario.

On the basis of mixed farming, Ontario still occupies the premier position in agriculture.

The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) described to the House a few days ago Ontario's fabulous base and precious metal resources, the spectacular rise in our nickel production, and the establishment of Ontario as the greatest producer of uranium in the world.

About half of the personal income tax,  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the corporation income tax, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of all succession duties collected in the whole of the Dominion come from Ontario.

These figures represent in brief the position of Ontario, a rapidly expanding and prosperous province. But, as the hon. Prime Minister of the province has indicated in his submission to the Dominion in the Dominion Provincial Conference, while all that has been said indicates the prosperity of our individuals and our corporation, it is only part of the story, because such rapid expansion increases immeasurably the demands which are made upon the province and our municipalities.

It creates demand on the provincial level for electrical power, be it hydro, steam or atomic. It creates demands for thousands of miles of provincial and municipal highways.

In that respect, it is to be noted that only in 2 of the last 10 years has the province spent less on highways than it collected for registration fees and gasoline tax. In the same period, the province expended \$26 million more than it received from those sources.

Demand is created for hospitals and the hospitalization of indigent patients, for contributions to children's aid societies, for the care and after-care of tubercular patients, and for unemployment relief which fortunately has been of minor proportions in recent years. Our rapid expansion also creates a demand for aged persons' homes and, perhaps the heaviest of all, for capital and current expenditures for schools. In addition, it creates the need for a thousand and one other collateral services.

The Dominion Government in all its conferences with respect to the fiscal arrangements between the Dominion and the province, should remember the adage about not killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and not muzzling the ox that grinds out the corn. The one who fills the cash register should have consideration when the contents are being divided, lest the day arrive

when he cannot produce because of an undue burden of taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may I will leave the province in the very capable hands of the Lieutenant-Governor and his Council composed of the hon. Prime Minister and his hon. Ministers of the Crown and speak on behalf of those whom I represent: the people of York-Humber, the Township of Etobicoke and the Metropolitan area.

As what I will have to say with respect to the problems of the Metropolitan corporation applies in equal degree to the other area municipalities, I will direct my observations to the Metropolitan corporation so that my submission may be briefly and succinctly stated.

Firstly, may I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister of this province for the courageous manner in which he undertook the implementations of the recommendations in the Cumming Report. The steps which were necessary were not without political implications and complications. I have heard the chairman of the Metropolitan Council frequently say, after visiting most of the metropolitan cities in America where the problems are identical with ours, that until the governors of the respective states are willing to stake their judgment and their political future on the establishment of some such form of federal municipal government, it will never happen, on account of what is usually called the "upstate" or "rural" opposition to those who see and recommend the advantages of a form of metropolitan government for the large and expanding cities.

One other preliminary observation I should like to make is that, as one who was violently opposed to complete amalgamation and had some apprehensions about a metropolitan federation, I can now say that the progress which has been made has been infinitely greater than I expected, and that despite the very natural arguments and differences of opinion which occur from time to time. The Metropolitan Council has adopted the Metropolitan concept and is commencing to fulfill the challenge

presented to it in a very commendable and successful fashion.

Mr. Speaker, everything I have addressed to this House so far has been sweet and pretty, just as though we all belonged to a mutual admiration society.

Now I come to the stage when I propose to place the position of the municipalities and their taxpayers before you. In so doing, I am not unconscious of the demands that are made upon the Dominion and the province and the duties which each have to discharge, and I am not unmindful of the fact that the province subsidizes Metropolitan roads for 50 per cent., or of the fact that the Metropolitan Corporation receives an unconditional grant of \$4 per capita.

My view is that this Administration has recognized the vast importance of the Metropolitan Area to the economic life and prosperity of this province, and has been conscious of the fact that, just as the industrial, commercial and residential expansion of Ontario has given rise to a host of problems and demands for services on the provincial level, in the same ratio and to the same extent, the situation is precisely the same in the Metropolitan Area. There is one difference, and that is that, subject to the grants that Metropolitan Toronto receives from the province—and of course it receives none from the Dominion—it has one source of taxation only, and that is real estate.

Now the plain and simple fact is that municipalities have to operate within reasonable tax rates. Otherwise, not only does residential taxation become too oppressive, but what is worse, taxation upon industrial, commercial and financial institutions becomes too oppressive.

There has never been a truer word said than that municipalities are engaged in competition with each other, just as relentlessly as are businesses and commercial institutions. It is all very well and appropriate that we should extend the hand of fellowship and welcome to other municipalities and their representatives, but it will be well for us to

keep in mind that our plant and equipment which permits us to offer better municipal services must always be better than theirs, or industry, commerce and financial institutions which are the life blood of the municipality will go there instead of coming here.

The Metropolitan Corporation has carefully prepared a capital expenditure programme to be made over a reasonable period, so that the backlog of capital works which are long overdue and the capital expenditures which the expansion of the area require may be undertaken.

The capital budget was originally calculated for a 10-year period, but I expect will have to be extended over 15 years having regard to the magnitude of the works which must be undertaken.

Capital expenditures over the next 15 years are estimated at about \$1,050 million for an average of \$70 million per year.

I will file with *Hansard* the following details of that estimated capital budget, but will not take the time of the House to read the details:

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| Planning and parks .....                                | \$ 20,000,000          |
| Roads, net after provincial subsidy .....               | 130,000,000            |
| Welfare and housing net, after provincial subsidy ..... | 7,000,000              |
| Sewage system .....                                     | 80,000,000             |
| Education .....   | 150,000,000            |
| Waterworks .....  | 90,000,000             |
| Court house .....                                       | 5,000,000              |
| Share of new civic administration .....                 | 5,000,000              |
| Juvenile and domestic court .....                       | 1,500,000              |
| Metropolitan police and magistrates' courts .....       | 5,500,000              |
| Incinerators and dumps for industrial waste .....       | 2,000,000              |
| Rapid transit .....                                     | 150,000,000            |
| Area municipalities' debentures ..                      | 400,000,000            |
| Miscellaneous .....                                     | 5,000,000              |
| Total .....   | <u>\$1,051,000,000</u> |

That is the Metropolitan Corporation's capital picture for the next 15 years, but there are also current expenditures to be considered.

In 1954, the estimated expenditures of the Metropolitan Corporation were approximately \$56 million, of which it was estimated approximately \$21 million



would be met out of Provincial Government grants, water charges and sundry other revenues, leaving approximately \$35 million to be met out of levies against the 13 constituent municipalities. These levies reflected themselves in a Metropolitan tax rate of 14.7 mills.

We finished the year 1954 with a surplus of approximately \$2 million, which was applied in reductions of the amount required for 1955. The 1955 estimated expenditures were approximately \$62½ million and the estimated revenue, including the 1954 surplus, was approximately \$26½ million, leaving an amount to be raised by the levy of approximately \$36 million which was reflected in a Metropolitan tax rate of 13.7 mills.

The Metropolitan tax levy will be increased substantially in 1956 by reason of the fact that the Metropolitan Corporation has taken over the operation of the Riverdale Zoo and the Toronto Island. It has increased liability for servicing debentures representing works done in 1954 and 1955, and has accepted responsibility for the TTC operating deficit in 1955 in the amount of \$2,300,000.

The Metropolitan Corporation and its constituent municipalities are caught in the jaws of a vise. They have to provide the services which a municipality needs whether they should be charged against real estate or not. At the same time, they have very substantial statutory responsibilities in the social welfare field, which have no relation to real estate, and have rapidly increasing responsibilities for education which, one would be inclined to say, does for a certain percentage of its cost have a relationship to real estate.

When the Metropolitan Corporation has completed its 4 basic arterial highways, the Lakeshore expressway, the Eglinton crosstown highway, the Don Valley parkway and the Spadina north-west arterial highway, it will likely conclude that from then on it will be infinitely cheaper and better to move people by rapid transit than to continue building a succession of arterial highways and expressways which merely

add to the confusion and compound the problem and require more millions of dollars for downtown parking.

One of the reasons that the jaws of the vise are relentlessly closing on the municipalities is that the province adopts the position it will pay 50 per cent. of Metropolitan roads but no percentage of Metropolitan rapid transit. The general overall contribution of the province to education is 50 per cent. but in the Metropolitan area where its expansion is greatest and the demand is most pressing, it is approximately 15 per cent. for capital expenditures and 17 per cent. for current costs, and at the same time Metro has a walloping annual bill to pay for social services. All of the net cost of these things, after provincial grants, must come out of real estate taxation.

Let us look at a few simple figures which will point up the problem. They are from the Metropolitan 1955 Estimates.

#### 1955 EDUCATION COSTS CURRENT

|                                |               |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Metropolitan Toronto .....     | \$ 33,000,000 |
| Local area municipalities .... | 23,000,000    |
| <hr/>                          |               |
| Total current costs .....      | \$ 56,000,000 |
| Less provincial grants .....   | 9,000,000     |
| <hr/>                          |               |
| Municipal share .....          | \$ 47,000,000 |
| Provincial share .....         | 9,000,000     |
| Provincial percentage of total | 16.7%         |

The current social welfare costs paid by Metro were net \$5,735,049 after receipts of the amounts in the following statement:

|   | <i>Metro Expenditure</i> |
|---|--------------------------|
| Administration .....                      | \$ 73,000                |
| Hospitalization .....                     | 3,401,000                |
| Child welfare .....                       | 2,590,439                |
| Homes for the aged .....                  | 1,329,000                |
| <hr/>                                     |                          |
|   | \$7,393,439              |
| Less provincial grants .....              | 1,043,890                |
| <hr/>                                     |                          |
|   | \$6,349,549              |
| <hr/>                                     |                          |
| Less welfare and housing recoveries ..... | \$ 614,500               |
| <hr/>                                     |                          |
| Net Metro costs .....                     | <u>\$5,735,049</u>       |

In addition to a net Metropolitan social welfare cost for 1955 of \$5,735,049, there will be the amount paid by

the local municipalities for unemployment relief and other incidental welfare services.

I have now mentioned education, which cost the municipalities in 1955 \$56 million gross. Social welfare costs were \$8 million gross. These 2 accounts totalled \$64 million gross, in respect of which provincial grants were estimated at:

|                               |                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Education .....               | \$ 9,000,000        |
| Social welfare .....          | 1,043,890           |
| Unconditional grant .....     | 5,000,000           |
| Total provincial grants ..... | <u>\$15,043,890</u> |

This leaves the municipalities with costs for education and social welfare of \$49 million.

Now, that situation might be tolerable were it not for two matters which I desire to bring to the attention of this House. The first has to do with rapid transit and the second has to do with a national plan of hospital insurance. The latter may be the more important of the two.

It is obvious that the Metropolitan Corporation must provide more rapid transit to move its people and avoid the prohibitive costs of building an unending succession of arterial highways which are filled the day they are opened. The estimated cost of the next stage is \$150 million; it is for a subway under Bloor St. from Dundas on the west to Coxwell on the east with a subway parallel to Yonge St. on University Ave. from Bloor St. south.

The present Yonge St. subway will be operating at capacity within a few months as soon as the new cars on order in England are delivered to complete the 8-car train system instead of its present 6-car trains. The TTC cannot finance any such capital expenditure.

To service \$150 million of 30-year debentures at 4 per cent. will cost \$12 million per year. That is exactly 4 mills on the Metropolitan assessment when it reaches \$3 billion which it will do very shortly. The present Toronto Transit Commission is operating at a loss of about \$2½ million per year. To cover

the present loss and finance a new subway would require about \$14½ to \$15 million per year which is 5 mills on the Metropolitan assessment.

The whole TTC financial position and future policies will be worked out by the Metropolitan Council by midsummer, including a decision upon whether a 10c. fare structure can be retained or whether it should be increased to a 12½c. fare structure. In the meantime, it is my view that the Administration should give careful consideration to paying the same subsidies on rapid transit as upon Metropolitan roads, as it will be a contribution to a much more sensible and economic solution to the highway traffic problem than continuing to make contributions to an unending succession of arterial highways.

And now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me if a national plan of hospital insurance is established, the demands upon municipalities for capital grants to hospitals will exceed many times the \$5 million of capital grants which Metro has to still discharge at the rate of \$1 million per year out of current taxation, and the balance of which never seems to recede because as one grant is paid off it is replaced by another.

The delusion is that the municipalities cannot continue to carry an annual net current bill for education of \$47 million out of a total of \$56 million. Nor can they continue to pay 85 per cent. of the capital cost of new schools, which is proceeding at the rate of \$12 to \$13 million per year.

What is worse, once the province is hooked into a national plan of hospital insurance for \$150 to \$200 million a year, it will have no funds left to help the educational and other costs imposed upon the municipalities which no private enterprise can undertake, such as is the case in hospital and medical care.

If the province fills the catastrophe holes in the present hospital system and allows private enterprise to carry the balance, it will have revenues available to lift the crushing burden of educational costs off the shoulders of the municipalities, and could also contribute

to the cost of rapid transit as it presently does to Metropolitan roads.

If the province enters the field of hospital insurance and the reported costs of \$150 to \$200 million a year are a realistic indication of the result, neither the province nor the municipalities may be able to provide those services which make Ontario attractive to industry and commerce.

It has been in the best tradition of this province to provide an attractive climate for industry and commerce. That necessitates that the services required by industry, including water, sewers, roads, schools and housing, shall be provided and that in addition thereto industry shall have a conviction that its contracts entered into honestly, fairly, and above board will not be arbitrarily and unceremoniously cancelled.

We in this province and in this area do not propose to become hewers of wood and carriers of water. Therefore we must encourage private enterprise, allow our people within reason to provide for their own hospital and medical care, and assist them in those areas only which are beyond their ability to contend with. Then we will find that the potentially great future of our people can be accomplished. This future may be substantially interfered with if our tax structure—federally, provincially, and municipally—becomes overburdensome and oppressive, and we become a high-cost production nation unable to compete in the markets of the world which are so essential to our prosperity.

MR. J. SPENCE (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your honourable position as Speaker of this Legislative Assembly. As one of the new members of the Opposition of this House, the warm welcome I received from you, sir, and all the other members I have had the pleasure to meet, has been very gratifying. So to you, and through you, I bring greetings to all members from the great riding of Kent East.

It is with mixed emotions that I begin this, my first address as a representative of the Electoral District of Kent East. I must confess that I do not expect to be known here as an eloquent and colourful speaker, but I will try to be known as an earnest and hard-working member of this Assembly, always working in the best interests of the riding of Kent East and the Province of Ontario as a whole.

I will not try to be known for my sharp wit, but rather for my persistent attempts to see that my riding receives a fair and equal treatment in all matters. I will not try to impress anyone with my own importance, but rather will try to impress you with my co-operative attitude towards legislating for the benefit of all our citizens.

May I say that I am proud to be a part of such an Assembly and to be spokesman for all the citizens of Kent East, no matter what their colour, creed or politics. I might say now that I have come here with an open mind, determined to speak when it is necessary for the riding which I represent. I am determined to work for and vote for those things which are best for my riding, and not merely those things which are politically expedient.

Kent East is a riding of rich and diversified farm lands, prosperous towns and villages, and a shore line whereon some of Ontario's finest fisheries are located. We do not have any large urban areas or any large manufacturing industries.

I shall represent the farmer, the merchant, the small industries, the fisheries, and the various trades and professions that make up a wonderful part of our province. Naturally, the most important problems to which I shall address my attention will be those of the farmer, the fisherman, and the residents of the small towns.

I feel that I should draw to your attention the following matters and ask that they be considered at this session of the House:



1. The question of water and the plight of the Kent County Lake-Water Development Committee.

2. The need for some form of marketing assistance for our farmers.

3. The need for some constructive programme for our commercial fisheries and assistance in preventing the spreading of lampreys in Lake Erie.

4. The need for a long-term and practical programme for Rondeau Provincial Park, taking into consideration the best interests of the people of Kent East.

Now I would like to elaborate somewhat on these 4 points.

The riding of Kent East, particularly the towns and villages, are in dire need of an additional volume of water. To meet this need the Kent East Lake-Water Development Committee was formed with representatives from all towns and villages and the City of Chatham.

This committee has received support from the various councils and chambers of commerce. They were the first committee so formed. The committee was promised by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that Kent would be the scene of the first project in this water development.

Now I assure the hon. Prime Minister that I do not wish to make this a political issue, but merely wish to draw to his attention the fact that this committee is formed and ready to proceed along this line as soon as they are directed. I would like to quote from the June 11, 1955 issue of the *Chatham Daily News*, the following front page item:

The meeting attended by 14 municipality and township delegates heard a brief resume of the committee's formation on May 9 and a subsequent interview granted in Ridgetown to 4 of the committee's representatives by Premier Frost on May 24, 1955.

At this meeting the premier made two promises. First, Premier Frost said he would guarantee appointment to the provincial committee, headed

by A. M. Snyder of Waterloo, of a delegate representing all Kent municipalities and townships. Secondly, the premier promised that Kent County would be the scene of the first project of piping water from Lake Erie.

Now I understand this committee has not representation on the provincial committee nor has it received word of progress made to date on this vital question.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I say to the hon. member I did appoint the city solicitor of Chatham to the committee.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): As secretary. That is hardly on the committee.

HON. MR. FROST: He is on the committee. There are 5 members of the committee: Mr. Conklin, from Essex, Mr. Snyder, a doctor from London, the city solicitor from Chatham. There are 5 members of the committee.

MR. SPENCE: I understand he is secretary.

HON. MR. FROST: He is a member of the committee, whether he is secretary, or chairman or whatever he is.

MR. OLIVER: If I might interject, if the hon. Prime Minister will allow me, I do not know whether the secretary is a member of the committee or not, but if he is, it is an unusual thing to have a secretary a member of the committee. However, the point which the hon. member is making is according to the Chatham paper, the hon. Prime Minister apparently promised the delegation he would accept their nomination for a representative on this committee.

HON. MR. FROST: That was a misunderstanding.

MR. OLIVER: They were never asked for a nomination, but I cannot understand the hon. Prime Minister making a promise at that time and not going through with it.

HON. MR. FROST: I appointed a man from Kent. I thought that would meet the requirements.

MR. SPENCE: I have a copy of the *Chatham Daily News* in which the statement was contained, if the hon. Prime Minister would like a copy of it.

HON. MR. FROST: No. It is a fine newspaper, one of the best in Ontario.

MR. SPENCE: This committee has many practical suggestions. I ask that the hon. Prime Minister contact this committee and assure them that it is his intention to keep his promises. I believe that this committee has many practical suggestions to offer as to the development and maintenance of such a programme which should be to the benefit of all people. I hope this matter will be proceeded with soon so that this area may expand and grow and attract new industry to a home which needs and wants it.

Secondly, I hope that the government, through its Department of Agriculture, will study the practical aspects of some forms of aid for marketing crops grown there. Agriculture is one of the big industries in the riding of Kent East. We have in this riding the Ontario Government's experimental farm and the new Western Ontario Agricultural School in the Town of Ridgeway, which is doing wonderful work for the area.

This area is known as one of the cash-crop farming areas. Few regions grow such a variety of crops as white beans, commercial and seed corn, sugar beets, vegetables, burley and flue-cured tobacco, fruits and general farming. In the livestock branch you will find all the different breeds of cattle, swine and poultry. Some breeders of these animals have walked off with the highest awards at Toronto Exhibition, the Royal Winter Fair, and at Chicago.

The farming industry in the Province of Ontario, with the help of experimental farms, the new farm machinery and other new methods, has increased production so that now one farmer can

produce more than three farmers in the past. This has caused surpluses and over-production, resulting in the falling of farm prices.

At the present time, farmers are marketing some crops under the cost of production. What the farmer has to sell is low in price and that which he has to buy is the highest in the history of this province. I say that if these conditions continue to exist in agriculture, it will not be long till other industries in this province will feel the effects of these conditions.

I know the Federal Government has a responsibility regarding this, but I feel that the Ontario Government has a responsibility also. I feel that there should be greater study and greater efforts made to sell some of our products or to work out a solution for our agricultural problems. I believe that if there were a committee set up to work along with the Federal Government a great deal could be accomplished to help the farmers' diminishing income.

Thirdly, it has been brought to my attention that the fisheries in Lake Erie need some immediate assistance in lamprey control. I do not wish to see The Department of Lands and Forests neglect the programme in Lake Erie until extensive damage is done. Apparently control is more simple here as there are not the areas for reproduction, and I ask the Minister of this department to seek information as to how soon this programme can be implemented.

I believe that the heads of the industry itself should be consulted as to what the requirements are, and that representatives thereof should sit on any committees dealing with their problems. Some sections of the industry are hard hit financially by poor fishing, and I ask the government to consider what form of aid can be rendered over and above what has been provided by the Dominion Government.

It is a big industry and, as such, should receive more consideration than its members believe they are receiving at this time.

Fourthly, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we

have, located in Kent East, one of Ontario's many fine parks. It is rather unique in location and can perhaps only be compared to that of Ipperwash. People from Kent County make year-round use of this park with its fine swimming, boating, and other recreational facilities. It contains several hundred fine cottages which are owned by Canadians and Americans who are important to the merchants of our nearby towns. It also has several miles of drives through a standing forest where people can see a sight no longer common in our part of the country.

I ask the Minister of Lands and Forests to consult the people of Kent East as to their feelings before he makes any of several rumoured changes in the administration of this park. It is a boon to our riding and a wise policy as to its future is important to every person in that area.

I hope that the Minister will be guided by the best interests of the people which this park serves, and will not make a decision based solely on recommendations of his Fish and Wildlife Branch. I suggest that the department seek opinions from lease-holders in the park, and interview citizens of nearby farms and towns to try to develop a long-term programme which will serve the best interests of all, and not merely serve as a sounding board for some general policy to deal with all parks. Our problems cannot be considered the same as those of northern Ontario, and I ask the Minister to remember this before he acts concerning Rondeau Park.

MR. H. F. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. I can see you are carrying on your duties with the same dignity as your predecessor, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Davies). We are looking forward to the day when we will visit you in your chambers.

We know, too, Mr. Speaker, that we will miss Mrs. Davies and the charming personality she evinced when she entertained us. We know also that Mrs.

Downer lacks nothing in the way of pulchritude. We are looking forward to the time when we will visit her at the apartment.

While we have been away after pro-rogation, the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet have been doing a very fine job, looking after the citizens of Ontario. I wish to congratulate them, and as long as we have the present hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet at their posts I feel certain Ontario will go on to still greater heights of prosperity.

How do I know these things? There is a young man who is a "DP"—D. P. O'Hearn—who publishes a sheet which I call the "News Weekly of Queen's Park," or the "Reader's Digest of Queen's Park." It is in very concise form and you can get all the news without reading reams of literature which ordinarily come to you. You can, in 5 minutes, know exactly what is going on in the House.

For example, you can read in concise form, "Increases in Motor Vehicle Licence Fees Announced." "New Department of Economics Was Announced." "Small Increase Announced for OPP."

Which reminds me of going to the Planning and Development Board last year with a friend of mine who is a builder, and who wished to meet one of the high officials. I accompanied him there and said to the young lady at the desk, "Mr. Donninfeld and Harold Fishleigh wish to see Mr. Tyrrell." The young lady, being new on the desk, said, "If you will sit down for a few minutes he will see you."

I sat down for a few minutes and the builder got restless. He said, "Fishleigh, why don't you 'throw your weight' around and tell them who you are? You are a 'big wig' around here."

So I went to the desk and told the young lady, "I am Harold Fishleigh, MPP, and I would like to see Mr. Tyrrell."

With a sigh she said over the phone, "There is Mr. Donninfeld and Mr. Fishleigh, who is a member of the Ontario Provincial Police, who wishes



to see you right away." After that I was always known as a member of the provincial police.

We have a new hon. Attorney-General, the hon. member for St. Patrick's riding (Mr. Roberts). He has done a very fine job in decreasing the accidents in the Province of Ontario. We all have our own ideas on how to decrease accidents. I, for one, would not give a licence to a new Canadian until he was naturalized. There is a great deal of difference in riding a donkey—as any hon. member who has been in the southern part of Europe will know—as compared with driving a car with 230 horsepower. Of course if a man can prove he drove a car or a truck in his own country, he should have a licence here.

The hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle) has his own ideas, as have other hon. members, as to how to decrease motor accidents. He says the motors are far too high-powered and he would have them reduced. I think that would be a very unpopular measure, so far as Ontario is concerned. I would have to sell two cars and buy an Austin or a Volkswagen, or another make of car with small horsepower. I do not think it would be very popular with the people.

In the United States, I notice that 100 people are killed every day by motor cars and 50 to 80 per cent. of the accidents are attributed to the excessive use of alcohol.

I remember the late "Bob" Saunders standing up in the City of Toronto council chamber and saying, "If you drink, don't drive. A motor car is a very dangerous machine."

In the United States they are spending \$250 million this year in advertising various kinds of liquor. A survey showed that 20 per cent. of the women drink, so they are going to put beer up in fancy cans to appeal to the ladies.

In this chamber, hon. members—84 and possibly 98—are in the liquor business in a big way. We could almost put on aprons because we sell \$250 million worth of liquor each year. We could

put towels over our shoulders and go to work, because we are in the liquor business in a big way, but I do believe we are doing a fair job. I do not believe any other government could do very much better. Under the leadership of the new commissioner, the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings), a very fine job has been accomplished. He has opened up liquor stores to compare with banks and the brewers' warehousing company have opened up new warehouses which are very dignified. All in all, I think they are doing a very fine job.

I think we are doing very well. The hotel men, for example, have a difficult time keeping law and order. However, we are doing all right. If the hon. Attorney-General can decrease the accident rate by 23 per cent. by having a small campaign, what could we do if we put on a real campaign? We could go ahead with an educational programme in the schools and colleges so as to instruct people that if they drive they should not drink.

I know it is not a very popular course. The school teachers were notified of a course and only two sent in their names as desirous of taking such a course of instruction in connection with the use of liquor. We could do a great deal, if we spent more money on advertising in regard to the abuse of alcohol, especially when driving a car.

Mr. Speaker, I have been "harping" on "termites" for the last 4 years and I have not got very far. Someone has suggested that we should drop the word "Progressive" before "Progressive Conservative", because during the year we have not been able to kill one termite. Possibly one may have been driven out of this chamber at the last election.

However, we have had some accomplishments. The hon. Minister of Agriculture last year said that he would help and he referred me to Prof. W. E. Heming, who is professor of entomology and zoology at the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph. He is a very clever person. He was 9 years in Los

Angeles, California, and he tells me that they have 9 kinds of termites in California. In Ontario, we have only one kind, the red variety. He also tells me that we have been "fiddling around" here too long with termites, that termites cannot be isolated in any section of Ontario, but will spread as far north as North Bay. I gave him a list of the places at which to call in Woodbine riding, which are infested with termites. I will read you one or two of his replies.

*Mrs. Stanley Reid*  
109 Glenmore Road

This residence was formerly occupied by Mr. A. F. Tode, whose present address is unknown. Mr. Reid is now in Sunnybrook Hospital and he may have to have a leg amputated. The house is badly riddled with termites and I doubt if it would be possible to completely eradicate the infestation and prevent re-infestation.

There is another letter from 241 Gainsborough Road. Prof. Heming says:

These householders certainly have my sympathy and in some cases, at least, are as much the victims of circumstances as the Hurricane Hazel sufferers. The City of Toronto, itself, is going to have to take the situation seriously some time and the longer it is postponed, the bigger the problem.

To find out what was done in the case of infestation, Professor Heming wrote to the various cities in the United States which were infested and he got a report. I will table the report for *Hansard*, so you can have it in case you have trouble with termites in your ridings.

Briefly, the situation is as follows. Sometimes the state looks after the termites and in other instances the city looks after the matter. The chief problem arises when you buy a house. In the United States, where termites infest an area, they have an inspector who is hired by the city, going in and, for a

small fee, inspects the house. If it is termite free, you get a certificate.

Eventually, in Ontario, we will have to give most of our houses, particularly the new ones, special treatment for termites. It costs \$200 or \$300 extra. The termites get into the new places and attack the older places.

For example, in the case of a new apartment in my riding, the builders put the lumber on the ground before they built the apartment; the termites got into the lumber; then the builders put that lumber in the third floor; so now the termites are in the third floor of a brand new apartment house.

The time is ripe for the city and the province to get together and, now that we know the treatment which is proving effective in the United States, do something about termites.

The report to which I referred is as follows:

"Information was requested by letter of city officials in Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Los Angeles. The same enquiry went to a consulting entomologist acquaintance of Baltimore, to a now-retired pest control operator in California, who has specialized in termite control problems and is now on the Structural Pest Control Board of the State, and to the technical director of the National Pest Control Association, Inc. (USA).

"The questions asked were as follows:

"1. Is it the responsibility of the potential home-purchaser to have the building inspected for termite infestation, before purchase? Upon whom would he call to do this inspection?

"2. If not, what legislation, by-laws, etc. protect the purchaser, if any?

"3. In your city does the city engineer's or public works department have any responsibility in the case of, for e.g., a localized infestation of termites in one part of the city? Does your city employ a well qualified entomologist or other officer who might do the inspecting suggested in 1, or who might inspect the work of a commercial pest control

operator and approve or disapprove of it? In other words, how are standards maintained?

"4. Does your state have a law pertaining to termite or other pest control, other than those concerned with interstate commerce?

"5. If the licencing of pest control operators is required in your state, what governmental department is responsible?

"6. In your state, are termites the 'responsibility' of The Department of Agriculture, Public Health, or any other governmental department?

"No replies were received from Boston or Philadelphia. Both cities are known to have termite problems and to have suffered termite damage of some proportions in past years. Only the other day I received a clipping from the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, December 27, 1955, in which a letter from a home purchaser who found later that the house was infested with termites, was answered by 'A Philadelphia Lawyer', part of a feature column entitled 'First-Aid Law'. The letter and answer were as follows:"

Whether this advice is in keeping with our laws, I am in no position to say.

DEAR PHILADELPHIA LAWYER:

I recently purchased a house at a fancy price which to all outward appearances was well kept and in good condition. However, shortly after settlement I learned that the previous owners had had trouble with termites. An exterminator checked and found the holes that had been previously drilled for exterminating the termites had been filled and painted over to eliminate any suspicion.

I asked my realtor how he could have overlooked this when he appraised the property for mortgage purposes, and he said that he had checked several joists but he couldn't check the area which turned out to be defective, because an apparently deliberate storage of furniture there made it inaccessible. A contractor now estimates it will cost several hundred dollars to repair the damage.

Since the damaged sections were deliberately concealed, doesn't this constitute fraud, and if so, can't I hold the former owners for the cost of the repairs?

ANGRY

*Answer:* More and more of these claims of after-discovered termites are coming up in the courts, and most of them are being rejected on the theory that the buyer ought to make certain of what he's buying before he puts his money on the line. As a matter of fact, some printed forms of real estate sales agreement now contain clauses providing that the buyer may, at his own expense, send in a termite expert before settlement to determine whether the property is affected, and if so, his deposit will be refunded.

Your case (and the Philadelphia Lawyer doesn't blame you for being angry about it) is somewhat different. Where an individual knowingly makes a misrepresentation to another, and the latter, in reliance thereon, performs some act in connection with which he suffers damage, the second individual is entitled to recover for his damage. However, the falsity of the representation must be beyond the knowledge of the individual to whom it was made.

You have such a case here; the only trouble with it is that you will have to prove to the satisfaction of a court and jury that access to the affected part of the house was deliberately made impossible for your agent. It's a tough case to win, but in the hands of a competent counsel it might be successful.

A summary of the replies received follows:

"*Question 1:* The purchaser of a home is generally expected to be aware of all of the features of construction and potential hazards of it. Termite attack is usually considered as just another hazard to structural members, and a careful purchaser will have a termite control operator inspect a house in which he is seriously interested, just as he will have his plumber give him an



opinion of the condition and capacity of the heating plant.

"In many areas of the United States it is becoming common practice for the purchaser, or the lending agency backing a mortgage on the property, to place the responsibility for this inspection on the seller. The seller then employs a termite control operator to inspect the property and to provide a certification of the termite condition found.

"Such is the practice in California and this same practice is spreading quite rapidly through the country, through its requirement by local offices of Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration, which are federal agencies guaranteeing loans for the purchase of homes.

"There are no standard forms for certification of the termite condition of a structure. They range all the way from detailed reports with a plan drawing of the structure, to the simple statement that it is certified that the house is free of termites. The latter statement, of course, is absurd, because no one can certify to such a thing from any reasonable inspection because of the many avenues of possible termite entry that are hidden.

"*Question 2:* If a purchaser does not have his own inspection or request a certification from the seller, *he has no protection*. He runs the risk of buying a house with termites which he may have to have controlled at his expense, just as he would have to pay for fixing a roof if he bought a leaky one.

"If a certification given by a termite control operator is found to be false, of course the termite control firm can be made to correct the termite condition. Usually such a situation brings a corrective treatment from the termite control firm without charge, but it has been necessary for the householder to institute legal action in some cases.

"*Question 3:* I know of no city in the United States where the city engineer's or public works department has a responsibility for termite conditions, nor do I know of any city that employs a termite inspector, either to check on the

work of pest control operators or to advise the householder. I know of no operation on a city level which would attempt to maintain standards in termite work.

"In Baltimore, when a request is received for information about or assistance with a termite problem, the matter is either processed through the Community Sanitation Division of the City Health Department for advice or through the Bureau of Building Inspection concerning the structural status as to damage that might have been done by termites.

"*Question 4:* There are several states with laws governing termite work. These laws have been successful only in part. They have added to the cost of termite control.

"In one state, there is a definite tax of \$3 per termite job, to support the governmental administration. In another, the inspection of 600 termite jobs a year, along with the other administration of their law, cost the state approximately \$20,000, which places the cost of termite inspections at \$30 plus per unit.

"In some states the inspection is not financed to the point that the enforcement is significant. In one state the officials have found that their law cannot be enforced to the point that a uniform standard of work can be insured from all operators.

"In the opinion of Dr. R. E. Heal who has had much to do with termite problems in the United States, 'there is nothing that works so well as public education in insuring sound pest control work. If the public, and incidentally the government, can refrain from hysteria and can exercise the common ordinary judgment that they were born with in the purchase of pest control service, the normal forces of competition will soon weed the poor operators from the good operators.

"I think that sound information provided to the public on the habits and potential damage from termites, with general guidance as to what may constitute a good control job, will do much

more good for the public than a whole bevy of inspectors'."

"Termite control is expensive so there has been a tendency for cut-price operators to move in and do an inferior job. This is apt to be true for Toronto also.

"*Question 5:* The department responsible for administration of structural pest control laws in most states, where such laws exist, is agriculture. In others, it is health, notably Florida. California's is under The Department of Professional and Vocational Standards.

"*Question 6:* In no state are termites a direct 'responsibility' of any governmental department. There is an indirect responsibility in some states where minimum standards have been established by law and the governmental agency has accepted the responsibility of seeing that these standards are maintained.

"This has led to some interesting and frustrating situations as far as the homeowners were concerned.

"The following states of the 48 have some type(s) of pest control laws: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Tennessee.

"Not all of these include termites in their terms of reference. Undoubtedly, California with its 'Structural Pest Control Act', administered by The Department of Professional and Vocational Standards, has gone the furthest. It should be kept in mind, however, that California's termite problems are much worse than in all states with the exception, perhaps, of some Gulf states."

My considered opinion is that if accurate information is provided the Press and other agencies to the effect that termites are present in Toronto (naming no particular section), that in some areas considerable damage to dwellings has been and is being done, along with accurate information on the habits and biology of this insect, the property buying public will become aware of the existing condition.

Buyers should be urged to have a home or other building inspected by a

licensed pest control operator before signing any final papers. The termite situation is nothing like as serious as in some sections of the United States, and legislation other than what we have in The Ontario Public Health Act respecting fumigation and extermination is unwarranted.

A bulletin on termites is in the process of preparation now by the Department of Entomology and Zoology at the Ontario Agricultural College. It will be some time before it is available.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to "smoke control"; we have set up a select committee on this subject, and they have been travelling all over the country, even down to Windsor and to Los Angeles. They tell me that the smoke and smog was so strong on the beaches in California they could not even see the bathing beauties down there. If anyone is resigning from that committee, I would like to be placed on it, because I know there is a smoke and smog nuisance in London, England, and I would like a sea voyage.

Mr. Speaker, you do not have to go to Los Angeles, to Windsor or to London, England; just come to Woodbine riding—to Greenwood Ave.—and you will find all the smog you need. On Greenwood Ave. there is a brickyard there legally, because it was there before the people built the houses in that area.

Business is very good now and they certainly work the brickyard overtime, stoking the furnaces with wood. The people around there say that in the summertime if they leave their windows open at night when they go to bed, and the wind changes it blows the smoke in. In the morning when they look in a mirror, they say they are thankful the Ontario government passed a law preventing discrimination on account of race, creed or colour.

Moreover, in their back yards, the brickyard owners have clay for making the bricks. They are only supposed to put one stick of dynamite in, but sometimes when they need a lot of clay they put in 3 or 4 sticks and it makes

a real "bang", so if you are asleep the chances are that when you awaken, you are standing up straight from the noises from the brickyard. Therefore, in regard to smoke control, please do not go to Los Angeles, Windsor or England, just come to Woodbine riding.

Now I wish to say something nice about the hon. Cabinet Ministers and the hon. Prime Minister—with no strings attached. When you affiliate with the Progressive Conservative Party there are no strings attached.

I suggest—and they are the only persons who can do it—that they should raise their own pay in the same proportion as has been done in Ottawa. They should also have a pension plan.

I have seen many a man give his life to politics, looking after his constituency, and when he becomes elderly and after some time, goes to the polls and is defeated, the next day when he goes out on the street seeking employment, he is about as popular as yesterday's newspaper.

I think they might also devise a pension plan for some of the back benchers, middle benchers and front benchers, if it could be arranged.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to say a few words about the acoustics in this chamber. I spoke about it last year. There is not much sense in bringing people down here to listen to the debates when all they can hear is a "mumble jumble". We should have an acoustical system. I know the children sit in the galleries and do not hear what is going on, and all they can do is look down on the bald heads, the gray heads and perhaps even see the spit curls of the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

I would also like to refer to this beneficent old structure. The picture windows are always surrounded by curtains which reach down to the floor, making this chamber look like King Tut's tomb. I wonder if anyone has ever heard of George Hees. He has a factory where they make Venetian blinds. I have inspected them and they work well. All you have to do is to pull the strings

and they work by letting the light in or out. I think the Progressive Conservatives are pretty good at pulling strings. We should pull these curtains back and let a little light in.

If we wish to be right up to date, we should have fibreglass curtains; they are the latest things. They let the light in and you cannot see out. I was in New York about a month ago, and went to see the United Nations building. The young lady who showed us through said that in the end of the chamber, facing the Hudson, the curtains were made of fibreglass, the latest thing.

They also have these in the windows at the new Holt Renfrew building on Bloor St., if anyone has not seen them before. However, I am afraid that fibreglass would be much too modern for this beneficent old chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to say a few words about the birds—not about the bees. I think most of the hon. members know all about the bees, but not about the birds. This winter has been a very cold winter, and the people of Toronto have been very good in putting crusts of bread out for the birds to eat. As a matter of fact, there has been a run on sunflower seeds. My wife went to one of the department stores and was told they were sold out. The people were lining up to buy bird seed at the counter. One jobber phoned me and said he wished to import two ship loads of sunflower seeds from Spain. So if any of the farmers have a surplus of wheat they should grow sunflower seeds and they would be sure of a market.

The people of Toronto have been feeding the birds and I hope they will continue to do so because of the difficulty the birds find in getting something to eat. I bought a bird house myself and put the food in. It was very nice to get up in the morning, and to sit having breakfast, looking out through the window and see the birds having their breakfast, too.

There are quite a number of different birds. There are some beautiful birds. We get some cardinals with beautiful red breasts. I call them the "Progressive



Conservatives." Then we get a flock of nice little birds who go "chickadee-dee-dee" and I call them the "Liberals." A little later another flock comes and they sit in long rows on the wire. All they do is squawk. They are starlings, I am told, and these birds stay there, and when the robins come in the spring they watch until the robins leave the nests and then they go in and lay their egg, and when the mother robin comes back and sees the egg, she says: "This is a funny looking egg and I guess I had better sit on it anyway." As a result, you have little starlings hatched out. That is what I call "real social security."

I would also like, in all seriousness, to refer to Jack Miner. He has an estate in Kingsville and there are thousands of wild geese which come every year to feed at his farm. This costs a lot of money. It is kept up mostly by tourists from the United States who give small donations, so that Jack Miner's son can find feed for the geese and ducks. The Province of Ontario gives only \$1,500 per year towards this fund, I believe. In the spring and fall the geese go "honk honk" when they fly over Ontario because they find that in Ontario we are so tight by granting only \$1,500 per year.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to say a few words about university graduates. This question has been raised in the House several times. In France, I believe they have 200,000 students attending universities and university education is free, the same as the primary and secondary schools. In England, I believe, they have only 45,000 students. In Canada, there are between 60,000 and 65,000. In the United States there are over 2 million young people attending universities and recently, President Eisenhower has authorized a supplementary loan of \$1 billion to further education.

If Ontario is to take part in this great expansion of industry, of the mines and of the pulpwood industry, we must of necessity have more and more university graduates. That costs a great deal of money. We should give more, and the industries of Ontario also should give

more. In the United States the Ford Motor Company, General Motors and other industries have given millions of dollars to university education; 15 per cent. of their income is exempt from taxation, if given to that cause. Here in Canada, only 5 per cent. is exempt. If industry wishes to thrive, we must have more university graduates. As a matter of fact, I understand the graduates in engineering are engaged a year or two before they graduate.

I heard a man who was talking to my doctor the other day asking for an appointment and the nurse said over the phone: "I cannot give you an appointment until September." Imagine waiting until September for an appointment. One might die 3 or 4 times in the meantime. The situation is becoming acute insofar as university graduates are concerned. We are bringing in graduates from other countries to take the places of Canadians, who should be educated here and take these positions.

Now, I wish to say something about toll roads. Quite frankly I have read and heard so much about toll roads that I do not know which side of the fence I am on. I would like to hear the committee's report before I make up my mind.

I do know we are progressing with our highways much too slowly. The people of Ontario are sick and tired of waiting for highways. We have heard about the traffic from Galt to Kitchener being bumper to bumper, as it is here in Toronto. We are thankful for the highways which have been planned and constructed, but construction is proceeding much too slowly.

For example, in North York a bypass is being built, starting at Highway No. 27, and ending at Bayview. This was started in 1951, and although we are now in 1956, only about 5 miles have been completed. We are supposed to have a highway from Windsor to Montreal. At the rate we are progressing, none of us here will live long enough to see it completed.

In the United States, I understand they can build a highway such as that

in two years. Why cannot we do it? If we cannot, we should get the Americans over here to show us how to build it. The government is alright, but the Highways Department is too slow. For example, one may go to a hockey match or to a football match at night, one may go to a baseball game and see by floodlights; but do you ever see the Department of Highways working by floodlights on our highways, with 2 or 3 shifts a day? We have a very short season here in Ontario to build highways, as the winters are too cold for construction.

I went with the hon. members to the north country, and when we asked them what they wanted there, they replied, "We want highways; we want them now". It is the same thing in southern Ontario; they want highways and they want them now.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to say a word for the vegetable growers in the Province of Ontario. The vegetable growers around Toronto have done very well for themselves with the expansion of the city, the little farms were picked up at high prices, and the people who owned them have been able to retire and spend most of their time in Florida. There are other vegetable growers, however, who are not doing so well.

In Ontario, we import \$90 million worth of vegetables and fruit. I am not against the importation of citrus fruits such as limes, lemons, oranges, bananas and so on. They are natural fruits for Canadians to import. But in the middle of the season, even at this time of the year, if you want a strawberry shortcake or tomatoes or corn on the cob, or other vegetables which are out of season, you can get them. Then when our own crop comes along, the people are tired of these things, and as a result, the growers have to sell their produce to the canneries at lower prices. The same applies to other things besides vegetables and fruits.

The other day I was late leaving the chamber and my wife went to a chain store to get some chicken pie. I liked it very much, and I asked where it was made. She brought the box. I have the

box here, and it says on it "Morton's Chicken Pie, Louisville, Kentucky."

Just imagine, Canadians have to go to Louisville, Ky., to get good chicken pie. Surely we can bake good chicken pies in the Province of Ontario. If we cannot, surely the people should be educated not to buy vegetables out of season. We are not too patriotic in many respects to our fruit and vegetable growers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about government "movies." I do not know if hon. members are aware that we have government movies. In Woodbine riding, we have 3 Conservative organizations with 3 meetings a month—ladies, the young people, and the men.

The men's organization wanted a movie, so they said: "Mr. Fishleigh, you go to the government and get a movie on wildlife." Now, I do not mean the kind of "wildlife" we have in the City of Toronto, I mean the wildlife in the woods in the north country. I called The Department of Lands and Forests and asked for a movie, and they said, "Mr. Fishleigh, we are sorry, but your organization is a political body; you cannot borrow the movie, but we will tell you where you can get one."

I did not bother to go any further, but I think it is high time that with 84 hon. members, we should be able to get a movie. The Progressive Conservative members should be able to get a movie to show to their constituents. I think the ruling is a very asinine one and should be changed. The CCF should be able to get a movie also. It would do them good, to see the good job we are doing with penal institutions, for example.

MR. MacDONALD: Is there a movie on that?

MR. FISHLEIGH: Yes, every department has a movie. It is alright, apparently, to get them if they are not for any political organization, but so far as the Progressive Conservatives are concerned, they are "poison" to their own government, and they cannot have movies.

Mr. Speaker, since the war, Ontario has started to grow up. We now have 1,250,000 more people here than we had at the end of the war. We have had that great influx of population and, according to the mayor of Toronto, every Sunday prayers are said and offered to God in this City of Toronto in 24 different languages. May I add that it is not an abbreviated Lord's prayer such as we have here in this chamber; it is a full prayer, in 24 languages.

The influx of population means that, due to the importation of these people, we have set up 32 consular offices, representing various countries. They are an innovation in Ontario. Most people do not know what a consul does. May I say that he does the same thing as hon. members do for their own constituents; he looks after his people and their many needs.

These consuls ask me many questions. They ask why they cannot have a licence plate to designate their particular country, something above the plate to show they come from such-and-such a country. They ask why they are not allowed into the better clubs, why they have to wait a long time to be admitted, and they say that in any other country they would be admitted right away.

They also ask why Toronto is not going to have an international airport. They say that only TCA, American Airlines and CPR Airlines can land in Toronto. As a result, the international airport is going to Windsor, where the German Airlines will land this summer, where the Japanese Airlines and others—from Colombia and many other countries—will come in. It looks to me as if Windsor will be the international airport of Ontario. That is good luck for Windsor, but bad luck for Toronto.

I am also asked why we stopped the International Trade Fair, and I do not know what to answer. I know that stopping the International Trade Fair caused a great catastrophe to Ontario. It is true that they lost \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year on the trade fair, but it brought people here from all parts of the world, people who never knew where Toronto was, or even that Ontario

existed. They showed us their manufactured products and in many cases later they set up factories here. We may have spent \$10,000, but if we get a big factory in return, it is well worth it. As a result, the apparent loss is made up 1,000 times by the influx of industry.

I feel that we made a bad mistake. Even if we lose \$200,000, we should consider that in comparison with the Canadian National Exhibition. I am told that many of these people who displayed products or manufactured goods at the trade fair also wished to do so at the Canadian National Exhibition but there was no room for them there.

Ontario now has 5 million people, and is a fairly wealthy province, and I think we could afford to have one of the trade fairs. At the present time, they are having fairs in Spain at Seville, Barcelona and Madrid. Surely we could have one. I know of no better way of advancing the welfare of the province than through the trade fairs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to Bill 80. We have had some correspondence from the mayor and the Board of Control, and I understand they had a vote at the City Hall. I doubt if we even answered their letters. I think Mr. Fred Gardiner, as chairman, has done a very fine piece of work, away beyond my expectations, and I hope he will continue in that capacity, but there will be a problem when he leaves.

Under the Act, the council appoints a chairman. My experience at the city hall has been that the one who does the most lobbying usually gets the job, if there is a vacancy on the Board of Control. He will say, "You put me on this committee, and I will vote for you"; in other words, they scratch each other's backs. I believe when Mr. Gardiner leaves his position, a new chairman should be elected by the people, and not be appointed by the body itself.

There has been mention made about the old-age pensions of \$40 a month, and I think all hon. members will agree with me it is insufficient. At election time, I visited many people, and we



would sit and chat in the kitchens, and I could tell at a glance they were old-age pensioners because their clothing was worn and threadbare. They had one good suit and one nice dress hanging in the closet, just waiting for the time when they would be taken to a cemetery.

One said to me: "Our water rates will go up next year." I said: "How much will it be?" and was told they figured on a \$1 increase next year. To most people, \$1 does not mean a thing, but to people receiving only \$40 a month, \$1 looms like a mountain, and I think it is time we increased the old-age pensions.

In regard to low-rental housing, we have been criticized for not building more. As a matter of fact, we have not built very many. We have done a good job as far as the working-class people are concerned, those whose incomes range about \$3,500 a year or more. In Woodbine the majority of the people are aged from 60 years up, as the young people have moved into Scarborough and some of the other municipalities, and are enjoying these very nice subdivisions.

We have not built enough of the low-rental houses to meet the demand. In the central part of the city, welfare workers can take you to many houses where from 3 to 4 people are living in a cellar, beside a furnace, paying a rental of \$18 weekly. In other places, there may be 7 or 8 people living in 2 rooms. These people are good citizens, but they will never be in a position to buy a house of their own, although they can afford to pay a reasonably high rent. It is true that we have not provided for those people.

During the last few years, this government has accumulated a great deal of land around the outskirts of the cities, and in the spring I understand it will be sold off to builders, to give them a "break". However, we have the land now, and it will not cost anything, under the National Housing plan, to build low-rental houses. They have

one project in Thistletown and another in Scarborough at the present time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we have heard a great deal about Canadians and "Canada of the future." I have here an item from *Saturday Night*, written by Prof. Arthur Lower, who thinks that Canada is going to the dogs. He says:

Canadians today live happily and easily on their grandparents.

I wonder how many hon. members of this House are living on their grandparents? That seems to be the theme of some writers.

MR. MacDONALD: He came from a good university. The hon. member might inform his friends of that.

MR. FISHLEIGH: Americans are bringing millions of dollars into Canada and spending it here to develop our industries and factories, and we also have new Canadians coming into this country, and we absorb them, and in a number of years we will be able to absorb the American capital as we have absorbed the new Canadians. However it will take some years to do that.

After that we will have to invest in foreign countries to build them up, the same as we have been built up here. There is really nothing to fear about American capital coming in. As a matter of fact, we may be in a bad predicament if we do not have it.

After the war, there was \$2 billion left in Canada from building the Alaska Highway. After the war, of course, we needed so many things. People were buying Cadillacs, and taking trips to Florida, and it got so they had to put an embargo on some things, because we had almost used up the \$2 billion.

Americans are coming here and bringing about \$1 billion a year into Canada, and investing it, and it is showing a good return. If we did not have this situation, our dollar would go down in value. As a matter of fact, it is on the "teeter-totter" now, sometimes up and

sometimes down. We need capital from every land, and we should not read such rot as is published by Prof. Lower in *Saturday Night*.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly. I am sure it was a unanimous choice, and I am sure you will uphold the dignity and maintain the impartiality displayed by your predecessors.

I would like also to join the hon. Prime Minister and others who have preceded me in this debate to pay my respects to the late Mr. James Dempsey. I had got to know him quite intimately. He was a "rough diamond" with a big heart and I am sure no one in distress or need ever appealed to him in vain. I want to join you, sir, in extending to his family and friends my sympathy in their loss.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion now being debated in this Assembly. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons), although his was a praiseworthy effort, was not up to his usual standard; perhaps his eulogy of the hon. Prime Minister was a little overdone. I also want to congratulate the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney). His voice was clearly heard in every corner of the Assembly and I am sure he will make some contribution to the debates in this Legislature.

I also want to congratulate him on his election last January. Of course, it was not unexpected by hon. members of our group. Perhaps my hon. friends to my right, the Liberal group, were disappointed, but surely not surprised. For it is a very difficult job to defeat a government which so glibly promises a bridge here, a highway there, or perhaps even a hospital.

The praises heaped on the hon. Prime Minister by the two hon. gentlemen were, I believe, embarrassing to him, for I believe him to be a modest man, and I think perhaps he would agree it was a little exaggerated. In fact, I wonder

what his reaction was to the statement of one Conservative candidate during the election, who said the 20th century had produced three great men—Dr. Einstein, Dr. Salk who discovered the polio vaccine, and the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Prime Minister was speaking last week, he pointed with pride to the great aggregation of Conservative members in the Assembly: 84 government members out of 98.

Of course the Opposition group is very small, only 14 members, but may I bring the hon. Prime Minister back to earth and remind him this little group of 14 members represents the wishes and aspirations of 850,000 voters in the Province of Ontario. In fact, this group received 50,000 votes more than the government candidates.

In true perspective the government, with 800,000 votes, elected 84 members; the Liberal Opposition with 500,000 votes elected 11 members, and the CCF with 350,000 votes elected 3 members. This fact, I believe, points out the urgent need for a redistribution of the ridings in Ontario. Redistribution in the years gone by has meant a great deal of "gerrymandering" and conniving by the political Party in power.

HON. MR. FROST: The last redistribution we had was unanimous. The hon. member for Oshawa was on the committee.

MR. MacDONALD: That was not a redistribution.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): It certainly was not unanimous; I opposed it, sir, in the committee. If it benefitted me in any way, I assure the hon. Prime Minister it was purely accidental. One has only to look at the map to see how my riding was carved up in 1954.

HON. MR. PORTER: But the hon. member is still here.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member did not protest it; he agreed to it.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I protested it before the committee. I believe the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings) will bear me out in that.

The need for a fairer system of distribution of riding representation was emphasized by the hon. C. G. Power, now a member of the Senate, who once described the manner in which constituencies are distributed as "unseemly, undignified and an utterly confusing scramble for personal and political gain." As long as redistribution can be controlled by a political Party, as it is at present, inequalities will not only be perpetrated but will be created by the Party in power in order to make the "safe" ridings safer and weaken ridings where their political opponents are strong.

The Government of Manitoba has come up with what might turn out to be a step in the right direction. It has announced its intention, and now given third reading to a bill, to set up an independent commission to carry out the redistribution of the constituencies in preparation for the next provincial election. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will give some thought to a complete redistribution before the next election rolls around.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment or two on hospitalization. The Throne Speech referring to this question is couched in rather vague terms.

Progress towards the adoption of a national plan was given a strong impetus when the Government of Ontario submitted its proposals to the Federal-Provincial Conference in April last and further amplified them at the conference in October.

Now I might mention in passing, this is 13 years after the national leader, hon. Mr. Drew of the Conservative Party, promised hospitalization plans in 1943 for the people of Ontario; in fact, it is 9 years after the people of Saskatchewan were given complete hospitalization plans by their CCF government, and 7 years after the government of British Columbia introduced a hospital

plan. The statements of the hon. Prime Minister have been very vague. The truth is this government is not sold on a hospital plan.

HON. MR. FROST: We do not want to get "sold."

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): They are getting "hooked" into it, is what the hon. member here says.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): That is the word for it, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps the government, when submitting their proposals to the Federal Government, never imagined for one moment the proposals would be acceptable to the Federal Government.

HON. MR. FROST: That is the trouble: they have not been.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): At least it would make very good election material for the Conservative Party in the forthcoming Federal election. It is my opinion the Provincial Government of Ontario was outmaneuvered by the Federal Government at Ottawa, and now they are saddled with something they do not believe in.

HON. MR. FROST: They accepted what? What did they accept?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): They made some proposals to you.

HON. MR. FROST: But they did not accept. That is not an acceptance, is it?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): 49 per cent., they promised you.

HON. MR. FROST: That is all right, but they did not propose 60 per cent.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The hon. Prime Minister has changed his mind since last year.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was "right on the beam" when he said, "Who's bluffing now?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, many statements have appeared in the Press regarding



the costs of hospitalization plans for an Ontario-administered plan—all of which is conjecture. I will try to prove the people of this province can have the benefits of such a plan with very little additional cost to themselves. Now the per capita costs for hospitalization in Saskatchewan for the year ending December, 1955, was \$22.35. If we compute this on the present population of Ontario, taking an approximate figure of  $5\frac{1}{4}$  million, complete hospital coverage would cost \$123,375,000.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. member talking about? He is talking of hospital coverage, is he?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): That is right, hospital coverage alone.

HON. MR. FROST: Do your figures include tuberculosis and mental health?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): No, not yet. I will come to that in a moment, if the hon. Prime Minister does not mind.

Now if we consider the offer of the Federal Government to pay approximately 49 per cent., which would be \$60,443,750, this would mean the Province of Ontario would have to foot the bill for \$62,931,250 for a complete hospitalization plan.

HON. MR. FROST: It could not be complete unless mental health and tuberculosis are included. How could it be?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Just a moment, sir, I will come to that.

HON. MR. FROST: What is the use of saying "complete coverage"?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): We would be satisfied with that.

HON. MR. FROST: Then how is that complete?

HON. MR. PORTER: It is not what the hon. member is satisfied with.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Now, in his remarks last year the hon. Prime Minister said certain deductions should take place in respect to that figure. Credits should be allowed such as payments made under the Workmen's Compensation Act, etc., which the Prime Minister estimated to be about \$8 million; public hospitals grants of \$21 million.

HON. MR. FROST: It never was \$21 million. I do not know from where the hon. member gets his figures.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): That is the figure in the public accounts, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: Where is it? I have never seen it.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Page 200.

HON. MR. FROST: Who looks after the indigent people in the hon. member's calculations?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): We would look after them, under the scheme, the same as they do in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. FROST: You are living in Ontario. Who is going to pay for it?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): If the hon. Prime Minister will give me just a moment, I will develop my point.

HON. MR. FROST: But your figures do not hold together.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I think the additional \$200 per bed granted in the supplementary Estimates last year, which would make a total of \$36 million, would leave the Provincial Government an amount of \$27 million to find.

HON. MR. FROST: But who looks after the indigents and the TB sufferers?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Now the figure which the hon. Prime Minister gave last year was this; to raise

\$50 million it would be necessary to assess a single person at \$14.40, a married couple at \$33.50, and married with dependents at \$55 per year.

HON. MR. FROST: I have used no such figures, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Oh, yes, you did. You had a new proposal every week last year.

HON. MR. FROST: Let us see the proposal. I do not think I ever made any such definite proposal.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Oh yes, you did. You stated these figures in the Legislature last year.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Yes, you certainly did. Married people at \$33.50, married with dependents \$55 per year would bring in a total of \$50 million; that is your own figures of last year in the spring session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we only have to raise \$27 million, not \$50 million, which is a little over half of that amount. So, if we only need half of the amount, it necessarily means we need only collect half the premiums.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member is very far away from his moorings and his facts.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): No, let the hon. Prime Minister look up his speech last year. I think he was reminded of elections not too far away, when he gave this programme.

HON. MR. FROST: I never gave a programme in my life.

MR. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I stated some basic facts here in the Legislature, but I never gave the outlines of any programme. It would have been quite impossible to do so until the matter had been considered at a Federal-Provincial Conference, and the matter is still in the negotiation stage.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The hon. Prime Minister discussed the point and gave those figures.

HON. MR. FROST: No, the hon. member is very far adrift.

MR. MALONEY: What page, what date?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): If the hon. Prime Minister says those figures are too low, may I take the figures presented to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects, presented by the hon. Prime Minister himself? On page 76 it is stated the costs of a comprehensive hospital care programme in 1957 would be \$165½ million. On the basis of the federal grant of 49 per cent., Ontario's share would be approximately \$83 million.

Now, if we follow the scale of premiums stated by the hon. Prime Minister and agree it will bring in \$50 million, we have to find the balance of \$33 million. Now we are already paying grants to public hospitals for the year ending, 1955, of roughly \$21 million which means the province would meet the remaining \$12 million.

Now the hon. Prime Minister will say my figures are too low. My reply is, I believe his to be too high. Perhaps the answer lies in between, but with all forms of insurance, it is accepted, I think, the greater the number participating, the smaller the premiums.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would find out what they pay and do not pay, that would be different. However, I will give it to him in a few days and take him out of the ether.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I will say, there is much to be said for the concluding paragraphs on page 76 and I quote:

Only a part of these sums would represent a net increase in expenditure for the community as a whole, since patients are already paying

either directly or through insurance organizations for a large volume of ordinary hospital services, while governments are also making a substantial contribution.

The net increase in expenditure would come from rendering a larger volume of hospital services to those not receiving adequate care today, most of whom would in turn be contributing to the plan on the same basis as others,

and this is the part of the paragraph I want to emphasize:

There would thus be mainly a re-direction of existing private expenditures through public while the benefits of insurance protection would be more widely enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, what are we waiting for? This government cannot delay any longer a much-needed service for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my annual plea for an increase in pensions for our senior citizens. It is a disgrace to know that in this great country, in the richest province in the Dominion, we expect our aged pensioners to eke out their lives on a measly pension of \$40 per month. Most of the western provinces are paying supplementary pensions of up to \$20 a month, and are meeting the increase 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, while the Assembly is in session, each day the members of the Legislature stand with you and recite the Lord's prayer. It must be very impressive to our visitors in the gallery, but do we really mean what we say? One line in that prayer says "give us this day our daily bread." You see, sir, it isn't singular—it is not "give me this day my daily bread," but plural—"give us this day our daily bread." This is something this government can do for the aged people, the pioneers of our great country.

It is interesting to note, sir, this badly needed supplement, which we in the CCF have advocated over the years, is now supported by both Liberal and Conservative members. Surely the

government must yield to such unanimity. I do plead with the Prime Minister to give serious consideration to this request, which I believe will be supported by every member of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, may I compliment the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) on his very fine speech the other afternoon. To me it was one of the highlights of the debate. Factual, well thought out; I think the choice of the government in appointing him chairman of the Municipal Advisory Committee was a very wise one.

May I say the hon. members of his committee are very able men, steeped in municipal experience, and I for one will be surprised and disappointed if some very good recommendations are not made to the hon. Minister.

While on the subject of municipal affairs, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word or two on assessment? Now, it is reported the other day the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Goodfellow), when speaking to the municipal convention, was very critical of the inequitable assessments in the Province of Ontario. He stated he had come to the conclusion that some county assessors were not applying the assessment manual prepared by The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Now, the only thing I can say is: it has taken the government far too long to recognize this. I well remember when speaking on this very subject in the debate in 1953, I stated it would be a long time before a uniform assessment would be in effect in the Province of Ontario. In recent years, we have now given some grants on a per capita basis. Again I say this is not entirely satisfactory and I think that is proven by the hon. Provincial Treasurer when announcing the increased grant of \$2 per pupil. His statement was "naturally variations in standards of assessments lead to obvious inequities." Although the pupil grant also entails certain possible inequities in other directions, they may offset some of the inequities arising from the general system of grants."



The truth is, Mr. Speaker, both systems are unsatisfactory. That is the reason why education grants range anywhere from 12 to 15 per cent. up to, as the hon. Prime Minister said the other day, 95 per cent. in some of the rural areas not assessing on the assessment manual of The Department of Municipal Affairs. I hope the committee will give a great deal of thought to this very complex problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment or two on the recent strike at the General Motors plant in Ontario. I want to speak specifically on the Oshawa plant, because I work there in between sessions, although it isn't very often. After a long protracted strike of 5 months' duration, I think any impartial observer would agree, gains were made by the union negotiators, and yet it required a strike of 5 months' duration to secure them.

Perhaps some hon. member may ask, was there no other way than by striking the plant? No, for the union bargaining committee had exhausted all conciliation procedure, and the corporation's final word was that the union demands were "uneconomic, unrealistic and unacceptable." So there was no alternative but a long drawn-out struggle for 5 months.

Now I may say this, sir, the relationship between the union and the company prior to the strike was very, very poor. Many complaints had been allowed to accumulate over the years and these complaints were the centre of some very heated discussions during the first month or so of the negotiations. But now, happily, the strike is over, and with acceptance of the proposals of the corporation by the membership, with the signing of an agreement up until August, 1958, I do hope with a better spirit of understanding of their various problems and with the right kind of approach we may now have industrial peace for some years to come.

The other day the hon. Prime Minister, when referring to the strike in General Motors, stated that he and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) had offered the services of the department on many occasions during the

strike. If an invitation had been extended by either side, he said, the government would have readily intervened, or interceded in order to try and effect a settlement in the long protracted strike. Now no such invitation was extended by either side, and I do not think any member of the government should by action or word of mouth, publicly criticize the union negotiators or the corporation.

The Prime Minister didn't do that, but the Minister of Labour did! For it was reported in the Press, when speaking at a convention in the Royal York one month after the strike had been in progress, he stated the workers of General Motors Corporation would not have been on strike if it had not been for George Burt walking out of the conciliation board meeting. Now, I do not agree with that statement, but my point is this. I think the Minister of Labour showed a great deal of partisanship when he made that statement. It was most unwise of the Minister to say what he did, during a major strike involving the welfare of 17,000 men and women. Is it any wonder labour leaders are critical of our Department of Labour when a Minister of the Crown is so partisan?

One thing I think we can agree on and that is this: it was well organized and well conducted, in fact a credit to the great trade union movement. No untoward incident occurred and, although sometimes harsh statements were made, no acts of lawlessness were reported. I think the members of the union are to be commended on their behaviour during this long protracted dispute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to deal further with the conciliation procedures when the hon. Minister of Labour presents the Estimates for his department.

In conclusion, I would like to express my best wishes to a very able public servant, now retiring from government service. I refer to Mr. John French, superintendent of this building. I can remember when first elected to this Assembly in 1948, I thought it was a very dowdy and badly illuminated place,

but great changes have taken place since that time, mainly I believe because of the good work of Mr. French. I am sure all hon. members will join me in wishing him and Mrs. French a long and happy life after his retirement.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, just so the record may be kept straight, and since the hon. Prime Minister has forgotten, I have had a chance to check page 1147 of *Hansard* for March 23, 1955, where there is a quotation of the hon. Prime Minister. Perhaps I may be permitted to read this one paragraph.

I shall give hon. members the figures in a moment, but let me point out that a comprehensive public hospital care plan would probably cost well in excess of \$112 million a year. That, Mr. Chairman, is no wild guess. In Saskatchewan, the cost of living is not as great as it is here, yet their hospital plan in 1953 cost \$22.40 per capita. Calculated on the population of Ontario, projected forward to 1957, on a basis of \$22.40—which might have no relation to that day—the total annual cost amounts to \$112 million.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I was not putting forward a plan. That was merely showing the House that those were the figures. It was not fanciful at all.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The hon. Prime Minister said he did not give any figures, and there they are, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: I might say that in a few days, I will give the figures to show they were underestimated by a large extent.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): On a point of order, the hon. Prime Minister cannot deny he gave those figures last year.

HON. MR. FROST: Those were Saskatchewan figures, not ours.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister has interrupted when I have one paragraph more to put on the record.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member is off the record now; his record is cracked, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: I know the hon. Prime Minister does not like to hear this, because he has denied he said it:

As against that, we have these possible sources of revenue, first, there is a personal annual premium which must be collected from all individuals in the province over a certain age, of say, \$14.40 for a single person; \$33 for a household of two; and \$55 for a household of 3 or more, which would give us \$50 million.

That is exactly what the hon. Prime Minister said and exactly what he denied that he had ever said, which is one of a dozen programmes the hon. Prime Minister has given in the last year.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I point out to the hon. member—as I was pointing out to the House at that time—the magnitude of any plan involving hospital insurance. That is what I was doing.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister denied he ever made the statement.

HON. MR. FROST: Read the whole thing. I was pointing out the magnitude of the scheme, and the extent of the amount of money involved. Some of the newspapers rather took me to task for that. I have here an editorial from a well-known paper in this city, taking me to task, and saying those figures were inflated. I can assure you such was not the case.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, the hon. Prime Minister should not deny it.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, the hon. Prime Minister did, black becomes white.

MR. HARRY WORTON (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, if I could be given an extra 10 minutes; I have an appointment tomorrow and I will do my best to finish as quickly as possible.

HON. MR. FROST: It is quite alright, go ahead.

MR. WORTON: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of informing the hon. members of this House that the riding I have the honour to represent has a historical background and was the birthplace of a distinguished Canadian who had a commendable military career, was mayor of Guelph, and led the Conservatives to government in this province and who still heads Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition at Ottawa, the hon. George A. Drew.

I would also like to mention that, while I did not want to bring business into this House, I feel that I should perhaps say a few words on what the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) said about the boys. I am a baker; during the last election, there were people who came to me and said, "Harry, we are supporting you on the Liberal platform"; 40 per cent. of them were supporting me on the Liberal platform. The rest of them said: "Twelve years ago, when you had the honour of being elected alderman, you promised more raisins in your buns and pies, and you have lived up to that, so we will support you in the next election."

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to have the opportunity to speak this afternoon for the first time, and may I express to you my congratulations on being elected Speaker. Having met you personally several times, I am sure your decisions will be most fair.

While I was not fortunate enough to have your acquaintanceship to the same extent as my colleague, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), you can feel assured that anything that may have occurred some 10 years ago will not be held against you at the present time.

I would like also to express my thanks to the Ministers and their associates for their consideration during my municipal career in the City of Guelph. I am now, however, an elected member of the Opposition and it will be my duty to criticize the government where I believe their proposals are not sound. I trust, however, that the criticisms I make will be constructive so that working together we can bring about the greatest good to the greatest number in our province.

Wellington South has always been well known for its industrial and agricultural products. In my riding we have the Ontario Agricultural College, which is recognized as the foremost institution of its kind in this country, and makes available to our young people the best agricultural education obtainable.

During the past two weeks there has been some discussion by certain members of the Legislature regarding civil servants. As the representative of Wellington South which, I believe, has the highest number of civil servants, I wish to say that I have found them to be efficient, sincere, and loyal in the performance of their duties and active in community affairs. In fact the superintendent of the Ontario Reformatory in Guelph last year received the award for the Citizen of the Year for extra community work over and above his regular position.

The only criticism of the government that I might offer, in relation to the civil service, is that in many cases the salary paid is not commensurate with the importance of the position occupied, and as a result there have been many instances where, because of low salaries, we have lost to industry and to other countries men of great promise. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is being penny wise and pound foolish.

I have listened to the criticism levelled at The Department of Reform Institutions in connection with its administration, particularly with regard to training schools. My personal knowledge, gained long before election to this House, of the Bowmanville Boys' School is that these charges have not been justified. I wish to say to the



House this afternoon that my observations have led me to the conclusion that the school was discharging its responsibility to society in a way that would merit general approval.

The only suggestion that I would offer to the hon. Minister in relation to these schools would be that I feel that the boys should be taught a trade which would serve to aid in their rehabilitation upon their release. I agree that the boys are being taught certain crafts and trades at the present time, but I feel the government should be a pioneer in teaching these boys the more advanced types of vocational training such as television and electronics.

Another subject I wish to discuss this afternoon is highway safety. The government has recognized the growing problem of automobile fatalities and injuries by the public statements of the hon. Attorney-General and the hon. Minister of Highways. But what is it doing, or what does it propose to do in finding an answer to the problem? To date we have heard or read about stricter enforcement of the traffic laws, but that is about all.

Is it not a fact that accidents, or at least the vast majority of accidents result from human failing—inability to properly appraise conditions, improper attention to governing conditions, errors in judgment, to say nothing of sheer stupidity and deliberate risk-taking? I wish to say to the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Child) that I think that accidents are not caused so much by horsepower under the hood but by lack of common sense behind the wheel. Wherever statistics are maintained from adequate accident reports and analyses, almost invariably the accident can be traced to human error.

The first step in any long range programme to reduce death, injury and the loss of millions of dollars on the highways must be the development of a driver training and driver examination system which will assure the public that all licenced drivers at least know what they should do, how to do it, and so relieve us from the constant exposure to tragedy which incompetence brings.

No fault can be found with the current programme of law enforcement. But if the enforcement officers, the public at large, and motorists themselves were confident that all drivers were properly qualified before first obtaining a licence, the government would have no hesitation in applying much more severe penalties to those who had not only violated the law but had shown their failure to absorb and obey the precepts laid down in the training precedent to obtaining a licence.

Quite apart from that, however, is the failure of the government to prescribe any course of action against those who, under the present enforcement system, show themselves to be consistently sub-standard. Why does Ontario sit back and do nothing to remove these poor drivers from our highways? The hon. Minister of Highways has discretionary power to take action against them in the public interest, but is there any organized procedure in his department whereby they are brought to attention for such disciplinary action?

In other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States it has been recognized that the driver is the source of our difficulties, and steps have been taken to make administrative procedures and records such that automobile accident prevention work may be centred and directed from the record of each driver.

No one political party can claim credit for this development. Here in Canada, coalitions of Liberals and Conservatives first introduced safety responsibility laws in Manitoba and British Columbia, Liberal Governments in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, and a Conservative Government in New Brunswick.

Driver record systems of one kind or another are in use in all these provinces but here in Ontario, if any record is kept of each driver, it is seldom or ever used for preventive purposes. Quite frankly, anyone calling on the offices of our Registrar of Motor Vehicles would recognize that the current working space and staff are grossly inadequate, if we are to consider that it is from the data maintained by

him, from the reports he should receive and the processing of such data that the highways eventually can be made safer.

It is my opinion that all records should be centred around the driver; that reports of every accident, or every violation of the traffic laws, should be forwarded to the Registrar and entered in that driver's file.

To have this information is useless, however, unless some procedure is laid down for action. New Brunswick has prescribed in its Motor Vehicle Act that a score be kept, charging each driver specified points for his imprudent acts, and requiring that specific action be taken to suspend his licence if his score reaches a point where it becomes obvious that he is a substandard operator.

Other provinces do not incorporate in the law any such point system, but it is of some significance that the two cities, according to the number of licenced drivers showing the greatest reduction in accidents involving death and bodily injury are Vancouver and Winnipeg, both in provinces where the point system is used for administrative purposes.

Has Ontario a point system in effect? Has the government enquired into the merits or failings of a point system and, if so, what decisions or conclusions were reached? It may seem trite to say so, but the lives and happiness of hundreds are jeopardized by the inaction of the present government.

We all know of the sum spent every year from our Unsatisfied Judgement Fund and all drivers know of the levy paid each year to keep it solvent. A study of the report of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles shows that, over a period of some years, the proportion of motorists involved in accidents who have taken steps to protect the innocent public from their negligence remains at just under 80 per cent. British Columbia, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland all indicate that from 90 per cent. to 95 per cent. of all motorists involved in acci-

dents are financially responsible and able to satisfy claims in damages made by victims.

True, the number of motorists is much higher in Ontario, but even the State of New York says that 93 per cent. of its drivers are financially responsible. The time is long past due for Ontario to initiate a full safety responsibility law to replace the financial responsibility law now forming part of our Highway Traffic Act.

There are no fundamental changes in administration required. There is a basic change in attitude, however, which is essential. Our present law states that a licenced driver loses his licence if he is unable to satisfy a judgment in damages rendered against him arising from an automobile accident.

Discretionary power is vested in the Minister (Sections 21(3) and 75(3)) to issue licences "to persons for such times and upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations and restrictions as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may prescribe." Sections 83 and 84 give the Minister the authority to refuse licences to those in specified age groups, or to those he considers responsible for accidents, or if desirable, unless proof of financial responsibility is filed.

In practice, no one would sue a poor labourer or the irresponsible youth owning nothing but his first second-hand car were it not for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, because it would not be worth the costs of litigation.

We must change our attitude. Every owner and driver must be made to appreciate and fully realize that his licence is not something to which he is entitled by reason of payment of a specified sum of money, but that it constitutes a temporary privilege extended only for such time as he conducts himself properly. It should be a privilege which is suspended immediately any question arises as to whether or not he may have been responsible for damages to others or established a record of law violation.

Reinstatement of the privilege should be conditional on clearing his name of charges of liability or irresponsibility and, if necessary, be subject to limitation of the privilege pending practical evidence that he has learned his lesson and will conduct himself properly in the future.

That is the combined effect of safety responsibility, driver record and point systems, and law enforcement. If nothing else, at least the threat of immediate suspension of driving privileges when evidence of ability to satisfy claims is not available at once will persuade many of our motorists to take precautionary action, whether by making them more careful in their driving, or by inducing them to purchase insurance against their liabilities, and to such degree should reduce the volume of claims currently made against the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

I do not set myself up as an expert in these various technical fields, but I do feel qualified to demand that the government examine all modern developments in the licencing, training, and control of drivers as well as the protection of the public from financial loss arising from automobile accidents. It should make known to this House what it is doing, what it has learned, and why it is not taking the action which other governments both in the United States and in Canada have found to such advantage.

If the government is not satisfied that the measures I have suggested are the final answer, the people of Ontario have the right to know what the government proposes to do to reduce the fatalities, injuries and property damage loss which are the curse of our highways.

Mr. Speaker, may I take another 5 minutes? It is past 6 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. WORTON: This fast talking is not too good for me.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member may take all the time he requires.

MR. WORTON: Thank you. I do not wish to bore you with a great many statistics, but there are some things which are technical, but which I think are important.

This last item which I wish to discuss is in connection with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. Since last June, I have learned of many of the things which are not living up to what I thought they would, and are not a "square deal" for the persons in the Province of Ontario.

When a person is hurt because of an accident, I feel he is not being paid as promptly as he should. That is what I have learned to the best of my knowledge, and if I am not correct, I stand to be corrected on that point. However, there are some things which I think should be looked into and straightened up very quickly.

One of these is the procedure that a person must take in order to collect under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I wish this afternoon, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to give to the House an example of what I believe is the course most of these cases must take.

Take for instance if a car, which does not carry insurance, runs into my car and I have damages. The course of action is to proceed with a full court procedure, that is, to issue a writ and statement of claim, and when the other person concerned doesn't appear, my lawyer—if he thinks the other person has no assets—notifies the Attorney-General's Department who then defends on behalf of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

Usually, a settlement of the amount of damages is arrived at, and we sign judgment against the other driver for say \$2,000 and \$300 for costs.

Now Mr. Speaker, Mr. X. owes me \$2,300, and it is the collection of this amount that bothers me. The way this operates, as I understand it, is that if I am going to collect from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, I have to have my lawyer prove to the satisfaction of the court, and also in reality to the satisfaction of the Attorney-General's



Department, that the other person has no assets.

The first thing my lawyer does is to issue a writ of execution, which tells the sheriff of the place where the man lives, to seize all assets that that man may have that can be applied against the judgment. The sheriff then either makes a seizure or gives what is called a *nulla bona* return. By the *nulla bona* return he states that there are no assets of the debtor that he can seize to apply against this judgment.

It will be noted here that the sheriff is an appointee of the Provincial Government and the Provincial Government should, therefore, in my opinion, be satisfied to rely on his statement that there are no funds available for seizure to apply on the judgment. But this is not the case.

My lawyer must then get an appointment to examine the debtor before a special examiner and ask him a great many questions as to whether he has assets and have typewritten copies of this examination prepared. It is necessary then to search to see whether he owns any land in relevant registry offices, we have to get a report from some credit bureau, to find out where he works and how much he makes, etc.

If we finally get sufficient information, we apply to the courts for payment out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and this entails a motion in Toronto appearing before the court.

At this hearing the Attorney-General's Department may object that we haven't sufficient information and that payment out should not be made on the basis of the information we have. If, however, payment out is made, then we get our money from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. This, Mr. Speaker, does not however end the matter, but the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund starts to try to collect from the debtor, by turning these matters over to collection agencies.

My main point, Mr. Speaker, is that if the money were paid out of the Un-

satisfied Judgment Fund as soon as a court judgment had been obtained saying that the money was owing, as well as a *nulla bona* return from the sheriff in which the sheriff says that there is no money available for payment out, very long delays would be avoided, the injured person would get his money when he needs it, a great deal of money spent in costs and investigations and motions would be avoided and the fund would be in no worse position. The department could on their own behalf have the provincial police or some other agency investigate the person who owes the money, find out where he works, etc., and put collection agencies to work to collect any money that they might have paid out that could be recovered from the debtor.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government should be willing to accept the *nulla bona* return made by their own sheriff. The way it is now, if I get a judgment for \$2,300, it will cost me almost all the \$2,300 to get payment out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

I sincerely believe, hon. members, this deserves your immediate attention.

I say the average person who has an accident of this type has to go through too much red tape to collect damages. In all fairness I think it would be a good thing if that were looked into, and the length of time it takes to collect the money were shortened.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): I do not want to get into a discussion across the floor of the House at this late hour, but I would like to say that the practice is to expedite the procedure as much as possible, and at some stage a little later on, I hope there will be an opportunity for me to place on the record just what work has been done by the department in that connection.

MR. WORTON: Thank you very much.

Another point I would like to add is: there has been a great deal of discussion with regards to the question of old-age

pensions. One of the first positions I had on city council was as a representative on the welfare committee. I quite agree that the government has made a great many changes affecting persons involved in mothers' allowances or old-age pensions, but this last move which has been made with regard to the \$10 assistance to the old age pension has not worked out too well.

The reason for that is that a great many of the municipalities feel that the government has said, "We will pay half if you pay the other half," and they are taking the attitude that the government suggests they should pay.

I would like to see \$20 a month given by way of assistance to those in need, the first \$10 paid by the Provincial Government, provided the welfare officer thinks it is necessary, then if another \$10 is desired to be given, let the city pay one-half of it.

I think the cities are by-passing some of their obligations, because there apparently has been no provision for it in the budgets. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should pay the additional \$10 and then another \$10 providing the city pays one-half.

MR. G. F. LAVERGNE (Russell) :  
I move the adjournment of the debate.  
Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) : Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to proceed with Order No. 59 on today's Order paper, in regard to Bill 98, concerning the establishment of an Ontario Water Resources Commission, and pass Bill 98 through second reading, and then continue with the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

It appears, at the moment, that it will be necessary tomorrow to have a night session, although it might not work out just in that way. I know that night sessions are not popular; indeed, they are something of a hardship, in view of the fact that hon. members are engaged here from fairly early in the mornings on various committees. It may not be necessary to hold a night sitting tomorrow, but I think we had better be prepared for it.

We plan to introduce the Budget on Thursday, and the debate on the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne must necessarily end on Wednesday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.20 of the clock p.m.











# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Afternoon Session

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Fourth report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....   | 553 |
| Game and Fisheries Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....  | 553 |
| Labour Relations Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading .....   | 554 |
| Town of Leaside, Bill respecting, third reading .....   | 554 |
| Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District,<br>Bill respecting, third reading ..... | 554 |
| City of Niagara Falls, Bill respecting, third reading .....   | 554 |
| Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955, Bill to amend, third reading .....                                     | 555 |
| Railway Fire Charge Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....   | 555 |
| Public Service Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 555 |
| Mining Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....  | 555 |
| Ontario Water Resources Commission, Bill to establish, Mr. Frost, first reading                                   | 555 |
| Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lavergne .....  | 578 |
| Recess, 6 o'clock .....   | 584 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

### THE GAME AND FISHERIES ACT

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Yaremko from the Standing Committee on Private Bills presented the committee's fourth report and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie.

Bill No. 37, An Act to incorporate The Metropolitan Toronto Foundation.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill No. 26, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill No. 36, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

All of which is respectfully submitted. (*signed*) JOHN YAREMKO, *Chairman*

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act."

He said: Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8: these provisions are designed to clarify and simplify the sections dealing with hunting and trapping licences in order to assist in the administration and enforcement of the Act. Section 4 of the Bill re-enacts section 26 of the Act which provides for a licence to take either one deer or one moose during the open season in any area to be designated by the regulations as an area in which the licence is valid. There is no other change in principle in these provisions.

Section 5: section 33 of the Act, which deals with the use of dogs in hunting caribou, deer or moose is, in subsections 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 unchanged in principle. Subsection 3 is new and will enable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to prohibit the use of dogs in densely settled parts of Ontario.

Section 7: the new subsections added to section 76 of the Act will be of assistance in the proper enforcement of the Act by empowering the court, in proper cases, to prohibit a person from acquiring a hunting licence for a stated period.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

## THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Hon. C. Daley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains 3 amendments. The first has to do with bargaining committees, enabling a smaller committee than that already established under the Act to appear before the Labour Relations Board. We are today in the process of organizing very small units of employees.

The second amendment has to do with giving power to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to establish rates of pay for chairmen of conciliation boards. There is a differential existing today between members of the legal profession and other conciliation officers.

The third has to do with enabling organizations to become amalgamated. As we know, there has been amalgamation between the two big Congresses, the CIO and the AF of L, and we can visualize a great deal of difficulty unless some steps are taken to have these people appear before the board to eliminate as far as possible the necessity of having them re-certified.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. D. MACDONALD (York South): Before the Orders of the day, may I raise a small point. It is small, but I think before it goes any further, we should correct an erroneous idea of what occurred in the House yesterday.

This morning's *Globe and Mail* carried a story under the heading:

LAKEHEAD NAME FOR NEW COLLEGE  
MAY BE REVISED

The following two paragraphs, the hon. Prime Minister will be interested to know, read as follows:

While the CCF leader was speaking, Premier Frost kept nodding his head in agreement, and when Mr. MacDonald suggested the word "Royal" might find a place in the

name, the Premier rose to his feet and said: "I have been thinking along that line myself. Let the legislation go through as it is and we'll give more thought to the name later on."

My recollection is the word we were discussing was "Aurora" not "Royal" as an alternative name for the college, and I thought perhaps we should correct it.

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Before the Orders of the day, I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House who are on the Standing Committee on Mining, that the train will leave here for the northland at 6.30 p.m. Thursday, returning scheduled to arrive in Toronto at 9.10 a.m. Monday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome to the House, this afternoon, students from Downsview Collegiate Institute; Sunnylea School, Etobicoke; Pine Grove School, from Pine Grove; and a group of student teachers from the Toronto Teachers' College.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I advise the House I have been notified by the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada that a conference will be held in Ottawa on March 9, and the provinces are invited to attend. I thought it advisable at this time to state we have accepted, and I will advise the Rt. hon. Prime Minister that we will be there.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

## THIRD READINGS

The following Bills were read for the third time:

Bill No. 3, An Act respecting the Town of Leaside.

Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Chatham Board of Education and the Chatham Suburban High School District.

Bill No. 13, An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.



Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Ontario Highway Transport Board Act, 1955.

Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act.

Bill No. 75, An Act to amend The Public Service Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

### THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

Hon. L. M. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act to establish the Ontario Water Resources Commission."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, perhaps I might give a little information regarding what has taken place. The matter of water supplies and water pollution has been one with which we have been concerned for some time past. It is now a number of years since The Department of Mines set up a special section of that department to study water tables in southwestern Ontario. There were meetings and hearings of select committees of this House in relation to water levels, conservation and kindred problems.

Mr. Speaker, underlying the water requirements of this province more than anything else is the incidence of the growth in population, and the industrial concentrations which have occurred in a very large way across this province in a very short time. For instance, there are cities and communities, such as Sarnia, which have grown from a population of 10,000 to one of 50,000 in 10 or 12 years, or even less.

We have our own example of the problems concerning water and pollution in the spectacular growth of Metropolitan Toronto, and there is evidence of this same situation throughout the whole province.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States there has been a different conception brought about by the requirements of industry for industrial water. In recent times, some of the problems we have here in Ontario have been occasioned by our proximity to 6 American states. We are faced now with difficulties arising from water contamination and pollution, which is noticeable in the Windsor-Sarnia area, where our waters are contiguous to large communities in the United States. Some of the taints coming from industrial waste are said to affect these American border communities.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is pretty general. We have, of course, power in The Health Act and regulations to provide for the mandatory treatment of water to eliminate pollution. That matter I shall deal with briefly in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, the problem came into closer focus last session. The matter was mentioned in the House at that time, and I had consultations with representatives of some of the water commissions, particularly of southwestern Ontario. Among those whom I met was an old friend, Dr. C. H. Reason, of London.

I am very sorry to announce that he passed away today. I should like to pay tribute to him as a very fine citizen, and one who took an interest in matters of this sort. Through his views and his representations, the matter came into closer focus a year ago, at about this time. I have mentioned this subject during and since the last session of this Legislature, which commenced on February 8, 1955.

As a result of the representations then received there were discussions held with the head of one of the very active committees in southwestern Ontario, Mr. A. N. Snyder of Waterloo. Mr. Snyder is a business man, and was at the head of one of the associations of commissions and boards in that region which was very much interested and concerned with this problem.

As a result of our concern, and the investigations and studies which have

been held, we are proposing to go very much further in this matter than was contemplated at that time.

These consultations were held frequently during and immediately following the last session. I think it was on May 4 of last year, I prevailed on Mr. Snyder to act as the chairman of an investigating committee to look into all the problems and facets of this problem, insofar as possible.

It was agreed by correspondence that a committee should be set up consisting of Mr. Snyder as chairman, Mr. W. D. Conklin of Kingsville, Mr. B. L. Bedford of Chatham, Doctor C. H. Reason of London, and Mr. J. A. Vance of Woodstock. This matter was reduced to writing sometime about last July, by what may be termed a "submission" to this committee.

Afterwards, on September 15 last, as a result of the conversations and correspondence, an Order-in-Council was passed, which reads as follows:

The committee of council have had under consideration the report of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works dated September 13, 1955, wherein he states that:

Whereas it is considered expedient that a committee be appointed to investigate the water resources and the supply of water for municipal and other purposes, and

Whereas it is considered that such a committee should be immediately appointed . . .

Therefore, on the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger), the gentlemen whom I have named are appointed, with powers very much the same as those contained in a letter written the previous July, and the personnel of the committee is listed. The Order-in-Council continues:

The committee shall report upon the following matters:

1. The present and prospective need for an integrated system of water supply in Ontario with particular reference to southwestern Ontario.

2. The best method of providing adequate quantities of suitable water to municipalities, industries, agriculture and other consumers.

3. The effects of the construction of an integrated water supply system or systems to municipalities on local water tables and on the availability of water resources for agriculture, including irrigation and other purposes.

4. The extent of pollution in the lakes, rivers and streams; and the best means of controlling it.

5. What legislation may be necessary to ensure satisfactory control of the water resources as well as the legislation which may be required to provide for transmission of water from source to municipality or user.

6. The estimated cost of an adequate system or systems and the best means for financing such system or systems on a self-liquidating basis.

7. The co-ordination of action by municipalities and the Provincial Government in the financing, administration and control of the water system or systems.

8. The best administrative organization for maintaining continuity of operation and expansion, and for providing efficient management and effective safeguards to ensure the purity and adequacy of water supplies.

9. The urgency of each portion of the water system or systems so that a schedule of priority of completion may be provided.

10. The best means of ensuring the province's continued control over water resources, particularly with reference to provisions of the international boundary water treaties and any other relevant Statutes.

Mr. Speaker, that last point, of course, was brought about by the interest taken by the International Joint Commission in this problem. The whole problem of the pollution of the Great Lakes system has become a subject of international concern, and has been a matter of representations between the heads of governments. That is the background of this

situation and the appointment of this committee.

Mr. Snyder and his committee proceeded with dispatch to deal with this problem.

There is in the submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects a very extended reference to this matter, to some parts of which I will refer in the remarks I shall make to the House on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the studies by the Water Resources and Supply Committee, under Mr. Snyder's chairmanship, have pointed up the need of water, that is, industrial water for irrigation, and for domestic use. This can be as important and as vital to our industrial and agricultural expansion as is power.

The studies indicate that the scarcity of industrial water and its influence on the location and expansion of industry ranks amongst the greatest domestic problems of the United States.

In the past month, in discussions with some of the leaders in the Congress of that country, I have been impressed by the importance of the situation with which the American people are faced in that regard, notably in the industrial portion of the northeastern states. I have been impressed by the effect it is having on the transference of industry to the south and even to the deep south, because of the greater availability and better quality of water which can be treated as industrial water.

I think the work done on various revisions in the Tennessee Valley at Muscle Shoals and other places has created large bodies of water on that river system, with the result that industries from the north are locating where the water is available.

Availability of water, its conservation, and its freedom from pollution are assets which are of very marked value in America. That is being underscored across this continent to a greater extent than ever. As a matter of fact, it has not been a subject of a great deal of discussion until within the last few years.

The availability of water, and its freedom and protection from pollution, are problems which run hand in hand. They are inseparable. In Ontario, as a result, we are faced with two principal problems.

Mr. Speaker, the conservation of available water supplies and their freedom from pollution are two subjects which have been treated in the past as different subjects, when, in fact, they are one. The two points are:

1. In areas, particularly in southwestern Ontario, we have a large population growth with dense populations in the valleys in which streams are diminishing. I refer to the Grand and the Thames. There we have supplies of water which are not sufficient for growth of population. Unfortunately, with the lessening of the water supply, we have a lowering of the water tables, a subject into which The Department of Mines has conducted an investigation. For this situation there are two general remedies:

- (a) The conservation of available water, in which very considerable work has been done, as evidenced in the Fanshawe, Luther, and Conestogo Dams in southwestern Ontario and other places.

- (b) The second, of course, is the addition to the amount of such natural supply, by piping water on an area basis, from the Great Lakes into the peninsula which we call "western Ontario".

In passing, Mr. Speaker, may I say this does not in itself constitute a violation of the agreement relating to the Great Lakes and the abstraction of water by way of the Chicago Drainage Canal, for the reason that the water goes through the Great Lakes watershed, and does not travel from one watershed to another but is confused to a watershed which runs into the Great Lakes.

It would not even be necessary to violate the conditions at Niagara, because water from Lake Erie would go back into Lake Erie. The same holds true in regard to Lake Ontario, and



water taken from Lake Huron and the Georgian Bay.

As a matter of fact, that point was raised in my hearing within the last few days. It is, of course, no different than the taking of water by the cities of Buffalo, Toronto, Hamilton and others, from the Great Lakes, and the drainage going back into those lakes.

2. The second problem is that with population and industrial growth the depositing of sewage and industrial waste into diminishing streams and into the Great Lakes is contaminating the remaining water supply. This situation results not only in the contamination of our own lakes and streams with all of its undesirable effects upon the people of the areas and affecting great natural assets such as fish and wildlife, but is also causing increasing embarrassment in our relationships with neighbouring provinces and states.

We have a situation in the Ottawa River at the present time, with which hon. members from that locality are no doubt familiar. We have the problem in all of the Great Lakes basin. These are important and serious situations, calling for a remedy.

The distribution of water and the elimination of pollution is essentially a municipal problem. Both are very clearly duties and responsibilities of municipal government.

We have had discussions in this Legislature, and, indeed, with deputations coming to us with relation to municipal problems and rights. It is, of course, argued—and I think very properly—that certain welfare matters are not matters for municipalities, but there never has been any question of the fact that the distribution of water and the elimination of pollution within a municipality is a municipal problem. Obviously, it is very clearly the duty and responsibility of municipal government.

The problem is not unlike problems which have confronted this Legislature before, for instance, in the matter of Metropolitan Toronto. All the duties

and obligations were there, but because of the form of municipal government, it was simply impossible to carry them out, and a method of effective partnership had to be devised. That was the principal problem which Bill No. 80 has so successfully solved in so short a time.

I am glad to point that out to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), and to the Opposition group, because my recollection is that all of the hon. members on the Opposition side voted against it at the time the Bill was introduced, and I am glad to be able to say it has worked out very successfully, and I hope we have found a solution to this problem with which we are confronted today.

We now have municipalities which have grown very quickly, and, indeed, we have groups of municipalities which have grown together, not unlike the Toronto situation. With some, their credit position is such that they cannot deal with the problem. We had that situation in this area, with Toronto, a wealthy municipality, being able to take care of its problem, but we also had 12 satellite municipalities, all of them in varying degrees of difficulty. Obviously, they were divided and could not deal with the problem, but, united, it has formed as strong a governmental body as there is in Canada.

In some of the municipalities, their credit position is such that they cannot deal with the matter; in other words, they may have the means to retire their obligations, but not the credit position to enable them to borrow the money, and the result is that in some areas nothing has been done.

It is quite true The Department of Health has mandatory powers to order municipalities to put in sewage disposal plants. The financing problem, however, is so formidable that many of them are simply unable to obtain the money, with the result that there are places which feel that, in the matter of sewage and pollution, there is nothing to be gained by them doing anything when others cannot or will not.

I think there are many municipalities which would go ahead, but next door to them is a municipality in a difficult position, and as a result the municipality which is able, in effect says: "What is the use, when next door we have a neighbour which is unable to take care of its problem?"

These situations call for very positive action. Our projections, which are on a safe basis—I was going to say "conservative basis", but I thought if I used the word "conservative", it would be misconstrued by the Opposition; so I use the words "safe basis"—indicate an increase of at least 60 per cent. in our population in the next 20 years, or an addition of over 3 million people, at the very least. In fact, we must reckon with the probability that it may be very considerably more.

There are so many unpredictable things. The United States is growing very rapidly. I think the forecast in the United States for the next 20 years is something in excess of 225 million people. I think it is fairly obvious that, with the growth in the United States, we are going to have a return immigration to this country, as this is the obvious and reasonable place for them to come. I expect they will come in thousands to this country.

Of course, that is something which is unpredictable; it is not certain. Therefore, the calculation we have made of a 60 per cent. increase in population has been made on a firm basis of experience and trends over the last few years, but I think it is quite possible to forecast an even larger population than that.

I was interested in listening to Mr. Gardiner, the chairman of the Metropolitan Council, when making his submission to the Royal Commission, when he forecast something in the neighbourhood of between 2 million and 3 million people for this area—I believe 2.8 million was the actual figure. If that were carried out, our population in the province in 20 years, instead of being in the order of 8 million, would be somewhat in excess of 10 million.

I would not, for a moment, question Mr. Gardiner's figures. I think they are undoubtedly possible, but our Department of Economy felt that our task in Ontario was huge enough, without any inflation which might come from perhaps too optimistic thinking; that it was great enough, as it was, to anchor us to obvious trends of these times. Therefore, I have used the figures I have mentioned.

It is obviously necessary, to meet the situation, to create an auxiliary to municipal government which can provide for the form of partnership required under which municipalities can work.

In introducing this Bill, I mentioned the original Power Commission Act, and I mentioned the fact that Mr. Snyder, the chairman of this committee—who, I am glad to say will be the chairman of the commission—had one of his forebears, his grandfather I believe, associated with Beck and Detweiler, and others, in the formation of the hydro partnership. This became implemented into law by the passage of The Power Commission Act, something over 45 years ago.

The conception which has always been followed was of a municipal partnership which would provide power at cost. The conception of this Bill is the same in main. In application, of course, it would be impracticable to have such as the immense power grid which now covers the face of Ontario, but this is practicable on an area or community basis.

The conception is water and sewage disposal at cost, the provision of water on a wholesale area basis, and the provision of sewage disposal plants which might serve more than one municipality. That is the conception of the Bill. It is a matter of providing the means of establishing both distribution of water and the disposal of sewage.

The present studies and proposals enable the commission to enter into agreements with municipalities on an area basis for the installation of trunk water lines and the installation of sewage disposal plants. By this means water

would be supplied on a wholesale basis and sewage would be disposed of upon the same basis. The pooling of cost of many engineering and other services, experience, etc., would save money all around us in hydro. Municipalities would pay for the services they would receive.

It would not be the purpose of the commission, for instance, to retail water. That would be a matter for local councils and commissions, nor would it be the purpose of the commission to collect sewage in municipalities by means of laterals, etc. This action would be a municipal matter.

The disposal however of sewage, which is a separate problem, could be taken care of by the commission on an agreement basis.

Again in main the commission's position would be to look after the wholesale distribution and disposal, the municipalities to look after the retail or local distribution or collection, as the case may be.

Obviously such a plan provides the basis of partnership which is so greatly needed in many localities, and at the same time would take the burden of the immense strain of initial financing from the municipalities and would enable the payment by them on a service basis over a long period of years of the costs involved. It is the principle of service at cost spread over many years.

It is quite obvious that the commission has an immense organizational task to undertake at once to provide for engineering staff, etc.

As I have indicated, the Water Resources and Supply Committee was finalized in an Order-in-Council passed last September. Despite this, considerable work has been undertaken which I will very briefly summarize.

A pilot area was first looked into and preliminary pipe line surveys were made by the committee. These surveys have been undertaken principally in Essex, Kent and Elgin Counties and 3 projects have been studied in a preliminary way.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Kent East mention the matter yesterday. I thought, as I always have, that I had carried out my undertaking in that area most completely. I intended to have an appointee to the committee from that area, and that I would regard that area as one of the pilot areas in Ontario, and I thought I had carried it out. I think, perhaps, it was a misconception on the part of the hon. member.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister will appreciate the fact that the hon. member for Kent East was reading from a newspaper as to what the committee interpreted his suggestion and commitment to be, and in its interpretation, the hon. Prime Minister had not carried it out.

HON. MR. FROST: I think the hon. leader of the Opposition will agree with me, and will be entirely satisfied with what I have said.

As I say, these services have been undertaken particularly in these 3 counties, and 3 projects have been studied in a preliminary way. They are:

1. A pipe line from Lake Erie to supply the Towns of Essex and Harrow and adjacent areas. In addition, a project for supplying irrigation water to the irrigation area of southern Essex.

2. A pipe line from Wallaceburg to Dresden and the adjacent area. Wallaceburg has a surplus capacity of water secured from the Great Lakes system; Dresden is in a desperate position with regard to water.

3. A pipe line from Lake Erie to St. Thomas and the adjacent area. In addition, an alternate proposal will consider carrying on the pipe line to the London area.

That is the matter with which the late Dr. Reason was very concerned, and in which he was greatly interested.

Engineering survey cost Estimates have not been completed on the above



and, therefore, accurate figures are not available. Preliminary committee Estimates for the above projects are as follows:

|                                       |                           |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Pipe line to Essex and Harrow..... | \$1,000,000               |
| 2. Pipe line to Dresden.....          | 450,000                   |
| 3. Pipe line to St. Thomas.....       | 900,000                   |
| (London extension would be extra)     |                           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          | <u><u>\$2,350,000</u></u> |

When I say that the implications contained in this Act are immense, I know the hon. members will agree with me that such is the case.

MR. OLIVER: Would this pipe line which the hon. Prime Minister has been talking about be primarily for the purpose of irrigation?

HON. MR. FROST: It would be, in the Essex and Harrow districts. That was part of the study. It was partially for industrial and domestic, and partially for irrigation purposes.

MR. OLIVER: It is not at all clear, is it, that we can use the water from the Great Lakes for that purpose?

HON. MR. FROST: I understand that is so, but in any event, water from the Great Lakes for irrigation purposes will probably be very expensive. Probably conservation water would be built up in our streams and water tables of the province, which would be more suitable for that purpose because of the less expense. It must be remembered that water which is piped long distances from the Great Lakes is obviously expensive. I should think that water from a reservoir, such as the Fanshawe, would be much cheaper and would be better for irrigation purposes, but again I am only expressing my opinion as a layman. I do not profess to know.

We have had Mr. Miller, of The Department of Public Works, working with others in connection with that possibility. However, it is a technical problem which, of course, would have to be dealt with by technical people. Certainly the opinion has been ex-

pressed that for irrigation purposes, perhaps in a general way it would be more suitable to use water which would be stored in the reservoirs of our own province, such storage would come about by means of rainfall and snowfall, and the usual things which cause an accumulation of water, rather than to have to pump water, but I am only expressing a layman's point of view, and I would not want to stress it.

The general conclusions of the committee, which of necessity here must be very general, are that the intensive development of the province, particularly southern Ontario, has created major water supply and sewage works problems. These are going to increase very greatly in the next 20 years. It is essential that steps be taken to ensure adequate water reserves for the future. This will require high expenditures on sewage and industrial waste treatment, as well as out-fall sewers.

The expenditures estimated on these projects during the period 1955-1975 are as follows:

|                                |                 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| (a) Water works projects.....  | \$1,100,000,000 |
| (b) Sewage works projects..... | \$1,300,000,000 |

This makes a total of \$2,400 million in that time, which would average out, when the plan gets under way, in the order of \$140 or \$150 million a year. This is, of course, an immense operation.

The report goes on to say that probably 60 or 65 per cent. of these expenditures will be required within the next 10 years, if these programmes are to go forward as they should, and keep pace with the changes which are taking place in the province.

Therefore, I present to the hon. members of the House a problem which is huge in its magnitude, and very important in its extent. A more complete reference to this matter can be found by referring to Appendix 5 of the submissions to the Royal Commission.

It is quite apparent that what I said on the introduction of this Bill, as to its importance and its implications, was by no means an over-statement. This is an immensely important and far-reaching

matter. It means that the problems of water contamination and pollution in this province have to be faced. Every municipality must become conscious of this and must take steps to eliminate it. It removes the difficulties of securing money, from a credit standpoint, and will provide ways and means for the retirement of costs involved on a long-term basis. Municipalities are, of course, empowered to proceed on their own.

As a matter of fact, if any municipality can proceed on its own, I can assure you I—and I think everyone—would be relieved, because of the magnitude of the requirements of money in this province today. The job which we have ahead of us in the next 20 years is enormous, without any exaggeration at all.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister one question? He has referred to the "terrific costs" which will be involved over the next few years. Am I correct in assuming he is referring to the costs to the municipalities? There is no indication that the government will pay it.

HON. MR. FROST: I am referring, of course, to the fact that water and sewage are municipal matters. I think that goes without saying. I will be referring to this more fully in a moment or two, in regard to another matter.

Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that if, for instance, the Town of Lindsay—in which I live—is faced with industrial expansion—as I have no doubt it will be, for it is on the perimeter of this great industrial area—that the requirements of the municipality for capital to provide for sewage disposal and water, is, of course, a matter of concern to the government.

Also, I may say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that the problem of credit is a very, very important matter. I think he will agree with that. To borrow, in the money markets of Canada and the world, the amount of money required for the development of our province, without over-extending ourselves, is one of enormous magnitude. I

would say it is one of the requirements of municipal people of this Assembly, and of the government, to keep our credit good; otherwise, we cannot do the job.

I have emphasized that during the period in which I was treasurer of this province, a position which I relinquished on August 17 last and the present hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) took over, the credit arrangements of this great old province of ours have been an enormous problem. They still are. I am sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer will refer to it. In my opinion, to provide the credit is an operation of very great importance, indeed, of some delicacy, due to the requirements of our province.

I would say that in connection with the credit difficulties of the municipalities, they are not faced with the same credit difficulties and the task of spreading their payments over a long period of time. Where they are, however, and if they are many, the commission can provide the credit, and the "know-how"—to use a current expression. Many of the obstacles which have heretofore been in the way of meeting this situation will, of course, be removed.

Orders hereafter made by The Department of Health, of course, must be effected. The hon. members of this House realize that in the past the orders of the Department of Health in that regard have been more disregarded than they have been observed for the reasons, and the difficulties, which I have mentioned.

The protection of water, its sources, and the prevention of pollution become the duties of every responsible person and body in this province. We have reached the stage where it is impossible to disregard the importance of this situation. I refer to the fact that the province is, of course, accepting the invitation to sit in with the Government of Canada, and the other provinces, a week from Friday, and it may be in order for me to point out that this is a very great task with which we are faced this afternoon, but only one of a series to be faced in this province.

This task alone is of sufficient magnitude to cause thinking persons to consider the credit facilities of this great province, and the capacity of our people to cope with this situation.

Perhaps at this time it is advisable for me to underscore, in this Assembly, the fact that it is perhaps a coincidence that the passage of this Bill and the convening of a new conference come simultaneously.

As I have stated before, the whole conception appears to be by way of equalization grants to bring all other provinces, and some of the governments—and I certainly do not remove the government at Ottawa from this reference—have the conception that by means of equalization grants, it is possible to bring all other provinces—regardless of their financial positions and obligations—up to the level of Ontario, and that would provide the solution of the problem. I would say it is not the solution of the problem, if any regard be had for Ontario's immense problems, which are created by reason of its being the *situs* of the earning of the very money which is required to bring about this equalization.

I think it is reasonable and common sense to regard the fact that concentrations of industry create obligations. To regard them merely as possibilities for additional revenue is completely the wrong conception. I said before the Royal Commission that such a conception was taking an archaic, obsolete view of the problems of Ontario and Canada today. I said on that occasion that the conception which grew up in the days of the Sirois Report, when there was no equalization, and when another Prime Minister stood in my place with the support of some of those in this House and spoke about "Ontario being the milch cow of the Dominion"—I make it clear that that attitude has fallen into the background. Those things are no longer the case. We are faced with a different situation today.

The conditions which were brought about when hon. Mr. Hepburn and the hon. Ministers who were then sitting on this side went to Ottawa in 1940 and

were confronted with the fact that, to save our country, our nation and democracy, Ontario and the provinces simply had to give up their taxation rates, does not hold good in this day.

In days of war, it may have been arguable that municipalities and provinces were unnecessary government appendages, in the great problem of winning the war and defeating the enemy, but in these days of 1956, the provinces and the municipalities are the right hand, indeed, the right arm, toward winning the peace which it is our great job to accomplish in our day.

The emphasis has changed. I think there is nothing which underscores the emphasis of the fact that we have great projects to carry out, in order to provide work and wages for the people in this country, than a Bill such as this.

What is required at a federal-provincial conference—and I do not think from what has been said that I am too optimistic in saying this, but it will come about in its day—is not only an assessment of tax sources but of the problems and requirements that are necessary so that the province can earn this money. It will take everything Ontario receives from corporation and personal income taxes to pay for the incidence of industry only, and then it will not be sufficient. We will not have enough money to apply on supplementary old-age pensions or upon hospital costs, or anything of the sort; all that money will have to be provided for industry alone.

As I look around this House, I see many hon. members who are representing communities which are faced with these great growing pains—for instance the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley), in whose riding a new city has been created, doubling its size to nearly 40,000 people simply by a decision by our Municipal Board.

Our position is not one of wealth. The hon. members who speak about "Ontario being a wealthy province" and a "province which can do this and that" are not doing a service, but a disservice, to our province.



I have been able, in recent days, to go to federal-provincial conferences and plead that we are not a wealthy province, but a province faced with half the obligations of this country. We are having our own difficulties. We are not able to indulge in many of the things which other provinces are able to indulge, merely because of the fact that we have the great incidence of industry and population, growth, and development, from which the money must come to enable other governmental bodies in this country to go ahead.

We have not only those problems, but on the other hand, the means to do this job are curtailed without understanding. As I have said before, I plead for an understanding of Ontario's position, and of the problems with which men and women, and municipal and other governments are faced in this province of ours.

There is an old fable about the goose that lays the golden egg. I substitute that for the milch cow reference of many years ago. There is an old fable that there is a goose that lays the golden egg, and I say that if there is any such bird in Canada, it is the Province of Ontario. I ask the hon. members of this House and the conference itself to bear that very important point in mind.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in regard to Bill No. 98; the latter part of the hon. Prime Minister's speech is sort of a preparation for the speech which he will make in Ottawa on March 9. I was thinking perhaps he should dress himself up in rather old and tattered rags which would depict in a very real sense, as he sees it, the poverty of this province. That might impress upon the federal authorities the necessity for giving immediate help to this poor, struggling Province of Ontario.

It might be that the hon. Prime Minister with his persuasiveness may be able to "sell" the Federal Government the idea that this is really not a rich province but is, after all, a very poor province. We will be waiting with bated

breath to hear what the results of this pilgrimage to Ottawa will be, and what effect the hon. Prime Minister's argument will have on the federal authorities.

The first part of the hon. Prime Minister's speech dealt with Bill No. 98, and I will now talk about that a few minutes. The hon. Prime Minister has reviewed with accuracy some of the background of this question of water supplies for the Province of Ontario. As we discuss the second reading of this Bill in the House, we are quite cognizant of the fact that the need for additional water supplies is not a matter which has forced itself upon us in the last few days, it is one which has grown up over a goodly number of years in Ontario. This is one thing that has been sparked by municipal conservation organizations throughout the province and, finally, the government has appreciated the responsibility they have in this matter, and the result of that appreciation is the Bill we now have before us.

In 1950, as the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, the conservation committee of that day—as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. F. S. Thomas) will recall—made a very definite pronouncement with respect to the need for additional water supplies. Almost 6 years ago it made a recommendation that the government should at once go about the task of preparing for the day which it saw at that time to be very close, indeed, when it would be necessary to make water supplies available to the people of this province.

This is not a new problem; it is one which has been with us for many years and it is one, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, Mr. Speaker, which cries out for attention and solution. It is a great problem, it is not one of miniature but of gigantic proportions, and a problem of that magnitude is one which requires a very definite move on the part of governments to meet the problem which exists.

The setting up of this commission is the government's answer to those who have cried out for ample water supplies in this province.

The need for water, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, falls into 3 categories: for industrial use, for sewage disposal, and for irrigation. I suggest to the House that one of the great needs of this province, particularly in the southwestern section, is the need which arises for water for irrigation purposes.

It is not clear in my mind, nor do I think it is in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister, that we will be able to take from the Great Lakes sufficient water to provide the irrigation desperately needed in the southwestern part of Ontario.

The hon. Prime Minister said we should get this water from inland reservoirs. Well, the County of Essex around Leamington and in that area, it seems to me, would be much closer to Lake Erie than a reservoir at London, perhaps a good many miles off.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of getting water from the Great Lakes for irrigation purposes cannot be discounted, nor cast to one side. I think it is of prime importance that we visualize the irrigation of southwestern Ontario from the Great Lakes and we should make plans, and take the necessary steps which will clear the air and give us the right—if that is possible—to take water from these lakes for that purpose. It seems to me that getting it from any other source, such as those mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister would be supplementary. I cannot see that it would be basic in character. I cannot see that it would meet the need which exists. Any other method that is used, I suggest would be only in a supplementary way.

The other matter I want to discuss for a moment or two has to do with the hon. Prime Minister's announcement that over the next few years "billions of dollars" would be required to be spent over the next 20 years, \$2½ billion, if my memory serves me correctly would be spent trying to meet, combat, and correct this problem. I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that this will be a costly business. It is a big job and you have to spend big money to carry it out successfully.

Why I asked the hon. Prime Minister if the main expenditure of this money would be on the part of the municipalities was simply that I believe these corrective measures should be taken, but I am sure as I am standing here in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities in this province are not in a financial position to carry the full burden that will be imposed upon them by the type of corrective measures which will be proposed to them in the next few years.

I believe quite sincerely that the Province of Ontario will have to come to the aid of these municipalities, and they will have to be given grants in order to lessen the financial impact upon the municipal taxpayers for these services.

I suggest to the House that we might as well meet that problem now, because I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will agree that many of these municipalities would have adopted corrective measures years ago, had it not been for the financial commitments and obligations involved.

The reason they have not done it is not because they do not see any merit in it. The reason that it has not been done is because they cannot see that they can place upon their taxpayers the additional load required to "put these things across."

I am suggesting to the House that the government, in making provision to supply the money, to loan the money to the municipalities and to do certain administrative jobs in connection with this venture and to supply the engineering services required, is just providing a drop in the bucket, in a financial sense, compared with what is so urgently needed by the municipalities before they can give implementation to the things about which the hon. Prime Minister has been talking.

I just want to say a word in connection with the Bill which I feel I should say because I feel very deeply about it. I believe that in the Province of Ontario we are "running"—that is a very descriptive word—we are running to

boards and commissions altogether too much in the matter of government. We are passing, by legislation, the authority of this Legislature to boards and commissions, which have not the responsibility to the people of Ontario which the hon. members of this Legislature have. I believe that, sooner or later—and it is better that it be sooner than later—we should take a serious look at the trend which has been developing in this province over the last number of years, that of handing matters of great importance over to be administered by boards and commissions.

We give these boards and commissions too much authority, we make them almost a law unto themselves, and the hon. members of the Legislature—the elected representatives of the people of this province—have little or nothing to say about how they spend public money. Their Estimates do not, in the main, come before this Legislature for approval or rejection. We do not know whether they spend the money recklessly; we do not know whether or not their administrative costs are out of all proportion to what they should be.

We have no way of knowing or telling, and yet we go on with the practice year after year of passing over to commissions and boards what I consider to be the rightful responsibilities of this government itself. I do not need to enumerate the boards and commissions we have in this province. I imagine they are 20 or more in number.

I remember a few days ago the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) spoke about the Kennedy Commission on Forestry. One of the main recommendations of the Kennedy Commission was that the forests of this province should be run by a commission, and that the Minister of the department would be but a figurehead, and very little else.

That is not my idea of responsible government; I believe that the Minister in charge of a department must be held completely responsible for the administration of his particular department.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that was not the Kennedy Report, that was in the 22 points.

MR. OLIVER: You must have received the idea from the Kennedy Report.

MR. MacDONALD: It is still in the 22 points.

MR. OLIVER: It is still in the Kennedy Report. It is not only in the 22 points but it is in the Kennedy Report. We will have to take a look at that together some time, but it was enacted into a Statute of this province.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not carry it out though.

MR. OLIVER: You what?

HON. MR. FROST: I did not carry it out.

MR. OLIVER: You mean you voted against it?

MR. MacDONALD: He passed it and did not do anything about it.

MR. OLIVER: At any rate, that is simply an illustration.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The only one of the 22 points not implemented.

MR. OLIVER: You did not implement any of them. This is the only one you implemented out of the 22.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not turn it around.

MR. OLIVER: The House will recall—I do not want to labour this—that there was quite a substantial opinion in favour of running a branch of Highways by a commission. That was given quite considerable deliberation a few years ago.

I want to reiterate what I have said, Mr. Speaker, and say most emphatically that I see a great danger inherent in this policy of passing the responsibility of



government to boards and commissions in ever increasing numbers.

Some day we will have to stop this practice or else the hon. members opposite will not have anything to do at all, as all the work which ordinarily falls on a Cabinet Minister will be done in the main by boards and commissions. That is not responsible government, I suggest, and it is not the way we should carry on this Legislature.

This Bill, which calls for a commission is, of course, no worse and no better than those which have gone before and those which will follow after. I am not going to oppose this Bill because it proposes to set up a commission, but I would draw attention to a tendency which, in my judgment, is entirely wrong and which seems certainly to be growing in this province.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Another supporter.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with a few qualifications I am going to be a supporter of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most speeches made in this House are forgotten almost as quickly as they are made, and perhaps it is just as well.

However, I think this is really an historical occasion, the import of which should not be missed. Today we are sitting in on the launching of another great public utility in this province and I want—if I may interject—in a moment to comment on the rather puzzling argument to which I have just listened from the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I think this is a great occasion because here we have another of these occasions when we the people of this province—a free people—face a great need which nobody is willing or apparently able to meet, and we are now going to take the situation in hand and meet it ourselves. That, as far as I am concerned, is not a denial of responsible government, is not a denial of democracy; it is an extension of the very basic democratic principle in the economic sphere.

I do not want to get into a long discussion on the theoretical point the

leader of the Opposition has just made. I was hoping I could “go along” with the hon. leader of the Opposition today but he forces me into drawing a distinction by his concluding remarks. What he is accusing the government of is being a bit too socialistic.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I was nothing of the kind. The hon. member should not say that.

MR. MacDONALD: Let me explain what I mean. He is accusing the government of being too socialistic in setting up a system by which the people will meet some of their economic needs.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand for that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Do not quarrel amongst yourselves.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member says my remarks were intended to convey the impression that I was against what he prefers to call “socialism”, but which I prefer to call “public ownership”. I want it understood in this House and throughout the province I have been known as a defender of public ownership long before the hon. member came here, and I will be here long after he is gone.

MR. MacDONALD: That is a very easy statement to make, and we will have to let events confirm or deny it. We cannot argue the point.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when there are great needs to be met in this fashion, you have two alternatives. Either you leave it to private enterprise to do the job—in this instance, apparently they are not willing to do the job because it is not a profitable kind of venture—or let the people themselves, through their duly elected government, take action to meet the need.

Are we going to put off the administrative details of this particular project onto some Cabinet Minister? I do not think it is a sensible proposition that the administrative details of it

should be put onto a Minister; I think it is a sensible proposition that the administrative detail of it should be placed with some commission.

On one point, however, I will agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not think we have worked out an adequate technique whereby we, the elected representatives of the people, can have a close enough look at the day-to-day activities of these commissions. May I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that I would be "with him" 100 per cent. on this point.

MR. OLIVER: That was my main objection.

MR. MacDONALD: No, your objection was—

MR. OLIVER: Well, I ought to know what my objection was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: Your objection was to setting up a commission at all. I say we should set up a commission, and then we should work out some procedure whereby this House is, in effect, the Board of Directors conducting the people's business. We should be able to look at what the administrators are doing, and be able to look at it more often than has been possible with the great Hydro Commission where, I understand, 4 or 5 years ago, the then chairman of Hydro came to the committee and delivered a speech for an hour or two and there has been no opportunity to look at the operations of it in any detail.

We have a standing committee on provincial commissions of this House in which we try to meet once a week to take a look at the kind of work that is being done on our behalf. It is wholly inadequate, because we simply have not the time. I think sometime we will have to find the time to get down to the business of looking at it.

This is a genuine difference, on which I feel as deeply as the hon. leader of the Opposition did on a point he was making a few minutes ago, that the

needs of the people of Ontario must be met and I think it is a legitimate proposition that to meet them, we establish a commission which is going to be under the control of this House. The alternative is a private set-up like the Board of Directors of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line, over which we will have no control at all. I had not intended this as part of my speech at all, but it has been provoked.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is interesting today.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it is interesting to be on your side for a change. And now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to do for a moment is to ask the hon. members of this House to consider why we are facing this problem.

This is not a static problem. It is one of our great problems—of great proportions already—but its proportions will grow greater if we do not recognize why it has emerged and what steps must be taken to restrict the proportions of the problem as much as possible.

Last night I was glancing through the 1950 report of the conservation committee. I was interested to note that the problem we face in the southern part of this province at the present time, the problem of undue floods at some seasons of the year, is not a new one. Apparently, the diaries of the 18th century and the newspapers of 100 years ago pointed out that Ontario experienced these recurring floods in the southern part of the province even in those years.

I assume that it is, in part, a product of the topographical nature of the land. Even in the past, when we had the forest cover, there was a great rush of water in certain seasons and consequent flooding. It cannot be denied that the basic problem was there, even when nature had complete control of the situation and man had not intervened.

However, it is a problem which has been increased greatly by man's activity. Some of this was inevitable, as we have rescued the southern part of this province from virgin forests for agriculture and industry. It was inevitable

that when the forest cover was removed, the waters would rush down and take off some of the topsoil.

There were some developments, however, which were not inevitable. If I may digress for a moment into another department, I would remind hon. members of the activities of the "timber barons", who very often stripped the forest resources in a senseless fashion, with the result that we have not sufficient forest cover to retain a great deal of the water which falls, and it flows off in this disastrous fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize to the hon. members, as we consider the growing proportions of this problem, that we must do something about the situation we face in southern Ontario today, because it is expanding and extending relentlessly further and further north all the time.

A year or two ago I happened to visit during midsummer the area from which the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Chaput) comes. I was rather struck with the problems they faced in that area, an area so far north one would think that, as it abounds with lakes, water supply would be the last problem with which they would be faced.

Yet, what was the situation? Because the forest cover in the watershed from Lake Nipissing had been stripped off to a great extent, in the springtime the water comes rushing down into the lake and raises it to such a level that it floods the cottages and property around the lake. So they had to do something about it.

In trying to cope with the problem, they blasted the rock lip of the lake so that it would not have such a high level in the spring. However, they have discovered since then that although they prevented the floods in the spring they have a dearth of water in the summer, particularly if it is a dry season. With these low levels in the summer the fishing and tourist industry are harmed, and in some instances bathing has become a question the health authorities have to consider.

With this water situation on the borders of Lake Nipissing farmers found their wells were going dry and they had to drive their cattle a mile to water. Also, the hydro-electric unit in that watershed had to be closed down for some time.

In trying to solve the problem created by this folly of man being repeated in the north as well as the south, they found that they had opened up a whole "Pandora's box of ills", which represented no solution at all. They have really been compounding the problem rather than solving it.

I draw this to the attention of the House because with this problem of water extending relentlessly further and further north, if we do not take action to prevent its extension, we will have to spend not \$2½ billion but much more.

I was interested in discovering in my files a clipping from a paper of June 24, 1954, again dealing with southern Ontario. In this clipping, Mr. F. H. Kortright, who is president of the Conservation Council of Ontario, made this statement:

Over large areas of North America, the lumbering and pulpwood business is literally sawing off the branch on which it is sitting.

The income loss from unwise deforestation is tremendous.

Then he goes on, a little later, to say:

In southern Ontario alone, 80 to 85 per cent. of once permanently flowing streams have either become totally dry or temporarily so in part of the summer during the past 100 years. We have been tragically slow to realize the vital importance of protecting our farmlands from erosion and loss of fertility.

That shows that 80 to 85 per cent. of the streams in southern Ontario are becoming dry in the summer, because we have stripped off the forest cover and created the problem to its full proportions, and as a consequence we are not able to deal with it today.



Mr. Speaker, there were two or three extremely pertinent paragraphs in the report to which the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) referred, the Conservation Report of 1950. In chapter 19, there is a paragraph on "municipal water supply." It is interesting to note, at the outset in this chapter, they point out that the problem of the conservation of adequate water has recurred in communities, as they grew down through the centuries, and that 75 or 80 years ago the countries in Europe were faced with this problem as their population density grew, and they had to take some action along the general lines we are now considering. The Conservation Report makes this statement:

Two million people, or almost one-half of our total population of 4½ million, are dependent upon sub-surface water supplies.

This was stated in 1950, and I presume, if brought up to date, the figure would be 2½ or 3 million. The quotation continues:

As shown on the accompanying map, these include the larger cities of London, Chatham, Guelph, St. Thomas, Owen Sound, Woodstock, Stratford, Kitchener, Brantford and Galt—cities whose sole limiting factor now for industrial and population expansion is water supply.

That is a pretty sobering and arresting kind of comment, to come from an authoritative description of the situation. The Committee on Conservation has this to say, on page 96 of the report:

Evidence presented to this committee, particularly from western and south-central Ontario, has been most emphatic on the apparent lowering of ground-water supplies. Not only do farmers complain that their wells are going dry, but many of the large cities mentioned above are finding it difficult to secure water for an increasing population, or even for their present numbers.

Note this:

This growing demand by our large inland cities has caused serious difficulty for farmers adjacent to deep urban wells, which deprive the shallow farm wells of much water.

So you can see the ramifications of this problem spreading out further and further.

Mr. Speaker, another comment in the report which I think extremely pertinent is this one:

To increase the ground-water supply, there is again no easy solution. Reforestation, the reclaiming of certain swamps for their original purpose and proper land use, are all important. Also necessary is the construction of storage reservoirs at strategic points in the river valleys which would serve the dual purpose of assisting flood control and recharging the soil beneath the impoundment, especially if the subsoil is gravelly or absorbent.

Then they go on to discuss the problem of recharging and replenishing the underground water supply.

Mr. Speaker, there is another paragraph which I came upon with a degree of sadness, because I thought this was an occasion on which I could rise and give unqualified support of this Bill on the part of the government. But I find that the first study of this problem, as the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned, was made in 1945, and it was filed away in the records of the department.

In 1950 the Conservation Committee took a look at the situation, and discovered the report was filed away. They gave solemn warning, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out, but it is only now, 6 years after that warning, and 11 years after the conducting of the original survey, that we are getting around to dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, a final quotation from the Conservation Report will give this House the nub of the problem. The quotation is:

The first objective of flood prevention and water conservation must be to restrain and control the water where it falls on the land, absorbing as much as possible into and below the ground where the need is greatest and where the sources of sustained flow can be stabilized.

When Ontario was mostly covered with forest, and the natural reservoirs, such as large swamps, had not been interfered with, the volume and speed of run-off was undoubtedly less than today. Falling rain water sank gently to the sponge-like forest floor and then slowly below. Moreover, river channels tended to be clearer and deeper when little or no topsoil was washed down to become silt.

Clearly, we cannot return all of southern Ontario to the primeval forest which was originally there. However, the report points very emphatically to the need of something that falls within the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Mapledoram), namely, that our reforestation programme in the Province of Ontario must be stepped up if we are to meet our needs. At the moment it is tragically inadequate.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. F. S. Thomas) issued a pamphlet which I received from his department some time ago, on *Farm Ponds and Related Problems*. It points out that 15 per cent. of the land in southern Ontario is marginal land as far as agriculture is concerned, and it would be economically sound common sense to restore to this land forest cover, partly for economic reasons, and partly for these other conservation reasons with which I am dealing now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the details of the administration the hon. Prime Minister has outlined. Experience must be our guide to a great extent, because we are pioneering.

Significantly, when pioneering is to be done, it has to be done by public enterprise and not by private enterprise. This is a point I would commend to the

government and which I hope will not be embarrassing. Last Wednesday we faced a very anomalous situation, where we found the government using public enterprise with regard to a pipe line, in what I say was not use but abuse.

MR. WHICHER (Bruce): You voted for it.

MR. MacDONALD: I voted for it, for sound reasons, as the hon. member knows.

HON. D. PORTER: Nevertheless, there was a vote.

MR. MacDONALD: In that instance, with regard to the pipe line we are abusing public enterprise, because we are using public enterprise to "bail out" private operators who refused to do the job in the fashion they originally committed themselves to do, and we are using it to underwrite the profits of American investment.

Here, with the commission, we are going to resort to a genuine use of public enterprise—use and not abuse—namely, as I indicated in my opening remarks, to meet the present needs of many people and municipalities. We are proceeding through the administration of our democratically-elected government, by setting up a commission to establish a public enterprise to fill the need. It is with a great deal of pleasure, in this instance, that I commend the government for acting in this way.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, last week the members from northern Ontario spoke in support of the Gas Pipe Line Bill, which will bring immeasurable benefits to the people, and definitely assure the future industrial and economic development of northern and northwestern Ontario.

During the 13 years I have been a member of this House, I know of no single Bill, no single Act of this government, which has brought more enthusiastic response and support from the people of southwestern Ontario than

the Bill which is before us for second reading today.

For many years, the shortage of water has been acute. Going back to early pioneer days, we have depended on underground water as our source of supply, but many wells have gone dry owing to the lowering of the water table, and others have become contaminated by rock salt, and the objectionable and undesirable hydrogen sulphide.

I made the comment last year that we have too much water at one time, and, of course, not enough at other times. When we spoke first of "irrigation," we realized it is the aim of the modern farmer today to dry out his land as early as he can in the spring, and get the water off—because, unless his farm is tiled, it is not too productive. However, as all hon. members know, there can be dry spells in the summertime, and then the farmers want the water back again.

With regard to irrigation: the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) was in the riding of Essex South speaking regarding water and irrigation. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have to go slow in regard to irrigation, because there is no use growing fruits and vegetables in this irrigated land unless we know we can sell them. Last year, low prices prevailed, and some of the farmers who had expended their money on irrigation equipment wished they had not spent it.

One point which has arisen in regard to irrigation is that the Federal Government is allowing \$80 million worth of fruits and vegetables to come into Canada every year, and as long as that is permitted to continue, we will not need too much irrigation. However, by making Lake Erie water available for domestic and industrial use, it is quite conceivable that the subterranean water supply will be replenished, and provide more water for farm uses, including irrigation.

Before I leave the subject of irrigation, I might mention one other aspect. We had a visit from hon. Robert Mc-

Cubbin, in this great fertile riding of Essex South, and a headline appeared in the paper reading,

#### IRRIGATION PLAN BACKED BY McCUBBIN

and the sub-heading reads,

#### FAVOURS FEDERAL AID FOR SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO SYSTEM

The article said, in part:

A call for federal financial aid toward construction of a southwestern Ontario irrigation system was issued Saturday evening by hon. Robert McCubbin, parliamentary assistant to hon. James S. Gardiner, Federal Minister of Agriculture.

Addressing a large crowd at the Essex South Liberal Association nominating convention in Essex Town Hall, Mr. McCubbin went on record in support of financial assistance along the lines granted in Western Canada under the PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act).

The St. Lawrence Seaway development "will bring prosperity as you have never seen it before," the MP from Middlesex South told the gathering, composed mostly of farmers from the large rural riding. "But the farms must be prosperous and irrigation is needed."

Obviously he was referring to publicity received by William Murdoch, Progressive Conservative, Essex South, during the past few months in promoting the irrigation scheme, which would bring water across the peninsula from Lakes Huron or St. Clair.

May I say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. F. S. Thomas) that I hope when he goes to Ottawa next time, he will remind hon. Mr. McCubbin that we can use some of the federal financial aid in connection with the problems we have in the Province of Ontario.

I will agree it was an election year, and he was in the riding of Essex South trying to secure a few votes, but I do



think we should bring this matter to the attention of his hon. Minister, to see if we cannot get some of his promised assistance.

We have talked for many years in this House about the desirability of, and advantages in, the decentralization of industry, taking the pressure of real problems from our overcrowded cities and large towns.

With water and sewage facilities available in our smaller towns, the one detrimental factor in their potential development will have been removed.

In the peninsula which comprises Essex County, we need water. Surrounded as we are on three sides with unlimited water, this would appear to be a minor problem, but it is actually our No. 1 problem today.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the members of the Water Resources Committee on the excellent progress they have made, in less than one year of operation and study.

The recommendations which the committee has already made will determine the future course, and the general economy of Essex County and southwestern Ontario, for many years to come.

In my opinion, the Bill which is the result of the work of that committee could bring us to developments on a scale equal to the present position of Ontario Hydro and the St. Lawrence Seaway, challenging to the fullest extent the technical skills and financial resources of our people.

It is amusing to me, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. members go back and say this matter has been before us, and we have not really taken any notice of it before, and that reports have been made by various committees and commissions. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there never was a subject which has been so constantly before the hon. members of this House as this subject of "water".

We have heard it from Opposition benches so many times it becomes monotonous, that we can provide and secure finances for building bombers, and enlisting armies and navies in times of

war, but we cannot supply ourselves with everyday needs such as hospitals, schools, water and sewage facilities, in times of peace. The answer is quite simple.

The Federal Government assumes full control of almost all taxation during a war, but the financing of our peacetime needs falls on the limited resources of the province and the municipalities. Under the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, thousands of homes have been constructed in Ontario, with a 10 per cent. down payment. The banks have financed the remaining 90 per cent., turning the mortgage paper over to the Bank of Canada, thereby obtaining the return of the monies advanced.

However, for every \$10,000 invested in a home, it requires an amount of approximately the same size to provide the necessary services such as schools, roads, sidewalks, water and sewage facilities, which have to be financed through regular channels.

The passage of this Bill will relieve the municipalities from meeting the heavy capital costs of water and sewage, and also provide them with engineering and planning services, which they would be unable to provide for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, many hon. members will have conditions in their ridings similar to those in Essex South, and in summing up the situation in Essex South, I could be describing the needs of at least 30 of the ridings of my colleagues.

The Town of Harrow, which has an unlimited potential in future development, has no public water supply, but depends on the private wells of property owners.

The Town of Essex has a water system supplied by underground wells, which is totally inadequate for present day needs. Severe restrictions have to be imposed during the summer months.

The Towns of Leamington and Kingsville are actually short of water in the summer months, and cannot take care of future expansion, nor can they supply the urban development which is taking place in the surrounding townships.

Villages such as Ruthven, Cottam and North Ridge, which would be on the pipe line route from Lake Erie to the Town of Essex, have no dependable water supply, and would quickly increase in population if water was made available.

The Village of McGregor, which also has a great future, depends on water hauled in by truck, and would be in a position to purchase water. The expenditure of from \$2 million to \$3 million, which will be fully repaid through water rates, will inject new life and new ambition into all these communities.

It will show the people of Essex South that this government is not afraid to step out boldly into the great future which is before us, nor will it ever overlook the welfare of our people, in terms of human betterment.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to support the Bill which is before us today.

MR. A. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of this water resources Bill. As hon. members know, I have always shown a great interest in the matter of conservation, and on other occasions have made reference to the great work being done by our 19 conservation authorities in the province today.

Unfortunately, the matter of polluted water seems to move with progress; and wherever we have progress in industry, we have to contend with polluted water. I feel that the Water Resources Commission will do a great deal toward assisting in the matter of the conservation authorities, and I am quite sure it will give them its unqualified support.

I have suggested on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, that we should possibly have a Minister or have conservation under a ministry. As it stands today, we have a certain amount of conservation in The Department of Agriculture, in The Department of Planning and Development, in The Department of Health, in The Department of Lands and Forests, and so on. I feel quite sure

that all the water resources, in any event, will now come under this government commission and it will have full power to develop it.

I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, of the great waste of water in our province. We are all guilty of waste, I suppose, to a certain extent and I sometimes think if we just took advantage of the water we waste, our water supply would last a great many years longer. In any event, we are doing something about this situation, and by setting up a commission with such broad powers, Mr. Speaker, as we see in the Bill, I know it will be unhindered in the kind of work it is to do.

Metropolitan Toronto gets its water supply from Lake Ontario, but I can see a day in the future—possibly as we grow more and more to the north—when the cost of bringing water from Lake Ontario and supplying Metropolitan Toronto will not be as expedient as, say, bringing it down from Lake Simcoe or some of the larger lakes in our north country. That could be a possibility.

I feel that certainly with the good judgment and the experience and the engineering ability this commission will have working with it, their "know-how" could very well be used to assist us in this great Metropolitan Area of Toronto in doing something about the polluted rivers, the Humber and the Don, those two great rivers, one to the west and the other to the east of our city.

Mr. Speaker, I know this commission has great work cut out for it, but it is not only going to be for the people of southwestern Ontario, it is going to be for all of the citizens of Ontario.

I would like to congratulate the committee on the work they have done this far. It has been my privilege to talk with some of the members during the past year, and they have done a great deal on behalf of the government. They have laid the groundwork for bigger and better things to come.

I certainly support this Bill. It is going to have, certainly, a far-reaching effect on our citizens, on our children

and on our children's children, for many years to come. After all, we cannot survive unless we have water, and now is the time to be doing something about it, and, as usual, our Progressive Conservative government is doing just that.

MR. J. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to speak to the Bill, and may I say at the outset that I am fully in support of it. I find no difficulty whatsoever in taking that position, in spite of the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

I think it eminently clear that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is likewise in complete and full support of this Bill, but emphasizes the proposition that we must be careful about the delegation of the powers of this House. That is a point on which I agree wholeheartedly with our leader and I suggest that the time will come, in the not too distant future, when we are going to have to give some real consideration to the fact that on numerous occasions we delegate the powers of this House to administrative boards without due consideration.

However, in this particular instance, I have absolute confidence in the commission that is to be appointed. My sole purpose in rising, Mr. Speaker, is to refer briefly to the chairman of the commission.

I refer, of course, to Mr. Snyder, who comes from my own district. I have known Mr. Snyder for some considerable time and I can assure hon. members that he is a gentleman of fine character and great executive ability, and I know of nobody who can do a better job or be more respected by all peoples in this province than Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Speaker, the only question I would like to ask the government, but, in the absence of the hon. Prime Minister it can be directed generally to the government, is this: at a meeting held in London not long ago—I am not sure of the exact time, but it occurs to me that it was 3 or 4 weeks ago, a

meeting of this committee and all interested parties—a discussion took place with respect to the problem, generally, of water. A great deal of discussion occurred at that time with respect to all the points which have been raised this afternoon.

At that time, it is my recollection, Mr. Speaker, it was suggested a general gridiron system should be inaugurated, that is, that separate pipes would not be built from a certain lake to a certain city but instead, basic trunk lines would be developed and subsidiary lines run from those trunks.

I am sure, with respect to my own city, Mr. Snyder will see to it that we are furnished with water just as speedily and efficiently as possible. However, it does give me some concern to think that certain cities are presumably going to get a preference in this respect, in that separate lines will be built and developed for the supply of water to those respective individual cities and, without mentioning any one, I think 3 or 4 were mentioned this afternoon.

I would ask the government whether that is to be the general policy or whether the policy which was suggested to the meeting to which I have briefly referred, whereby a general gridiron would be set up with main trunk lines and subsidiary trunk lines to individual cities, should prevail.

I certainly would prefer to support the latter suggestion, because it does seem to me that what we want is available water for the entire southwestern section and not merely one, two or three cities.

After all, if we are to give preference to one, two or three cities at this particular time, we will give those respective cities a great advantage in industrial development, and I think that our objective is to develop the area as a whole, and not give preference to any one particular section or city in that area.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and it is not my intention to pursue this thought any further, but simply to ask the government for some elaboration and explanation on this particular point.



HON. D. PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): I do not know whether I can answer the question fully, but, of course, the problem the hon. member puts forward is an engineering one, and depends upon what might be the most economical way of transporting water from the lake to a certain municipality. It may be that a single line to one municipality may be, under all the circumstances, more economical. However, it is the intention, of course, that it should not be done in a way that is going to give preference to any particular city. I think I can assure the hon. member of that.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the basic assurance I wanted, because at the meeting I attended, certainly they did talk in terms of a gridiron and I just hoped that the government was not abandoning that idea.

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I think we can visualize that as one of the eventual developments; but I think the initial project as mentioned dealt with a pilot operation, so that we would gain some experience and see how it worked out, and move on from there to something larger. After all, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, these things take years, and it is a vast problem we have ahead of us.

MR. WINTERMEYER: As long as it is not a matter of policy with the government that any particular area is going to be favoured.

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh, no, no.

MR. R. M. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister a question, if I may. I understand very clearly that this commission is going to sell water to the various municipalities, as is done with hydro, but it is not clear in my own mind where the commission comes in, as far as sewage disposal is concerned, except in regard to credit.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no, they are also empowered to build sewage disposal plants.

MR. WHICHER: They would build sewage disposal plants and own them?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WHICHER: Anywhere in Ontario, or just down where this takes place?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no, that is by entering into an agreement with the municipalities.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Down in the Ottawa Valley, too, you know.

MR. NIXON: There is a great deal of sewage down there.

MR. WHICHER: I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker. Before a sewage disposal plant is of any use, we have to have sewers.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WHICHER: This commission then would build sewers?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. WHICHER: The town would put in sewers, and the commission would build the disposal plant?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, the debate here today reminds me of the one that went on in this Assembly some years ago—in 1950. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will remember that occasion, when we introduced legislation respecting The Ontario Improvement Corporation.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): And that corporation has loaned, I think it is, \$10 million to various municipalities, and “bailed out” the Township of Scarborough, and a number of others which were going “broke”.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Yes, that is quite true, but I think, Mr. Speaker, the corporation was set up with a fund of \$50 million.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): And up until now I think the total amount borrowed by municipal governments is between \$14 and \$15 million.

HON. MR. FROST: We have \$35 million left to loan.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Yes. Now it comes to this point which the hon. leader of the Opposition stressed. We realize, of course, the great need for those services in the municipalities today, and under this legislation we are to give engineering services and other techniques. But in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, the paying of the services rests with the municipal governments. What we are doing is exactly what we did in 1950, that is, it is a little easier for the municipal governments to borrow, but they still will have to borrow. That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I would like the hon. Prime Minister to tell me, with the enactment of the new legislation, what is likely to happen to the Ontario Improvement Corporation?

HON. MR. FROST: It is still there.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): It is still there?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh yes, surely.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): It will carry on with this commission in operation?

HON. MR. FROST: They can borrow money to build their sewers. Supposing, for instance, that the City of Oshawa—which it does not need to do—required money for sewers and

water works; they can borrow from that fund. The other corporation does the wholesale end of the job.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The engineering?

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no, the sewage disposal and the trunk water lines. The hon. member should read the book his leader is writing, and he will get more information.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): My point is that we would still have to pay for it.

MR. EDWARDS: Does the hon. member want it for nothing?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): No, but the point stressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is that the need is so great today, they are already so overburdened, they cannot possibly assume the cost.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): That is the point the hon. leader of the Opposition made.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, does the hon. member make that point also?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I am prepared to support that point.

MR. WHICHER: One more question, if I may. Do I understand the hon. Prime Minister to say there is still \$35 million left?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know. That is the figure given by the hon. member for Oshawa.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Yes, I think it is \$14 to \$16 million already loaned.

MR. WHICHER: Well, there is more in the fund anyway.

HON. MR. FROST: If there is not, we will put some into it.

MR. WHICHER: Inasmuch as this amount has not been used, the municipalities have not borrowed it. How are they going to borrow any under a new scheme?

HON. MR. FROST: They do not have to.

MR. WHICHER: They had the opportunity to use this money before to put into sewers, and did not take advantage of the offer because they could not afford it. Now how are they going to do it with a \$24 million scheme?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: They can well afford it in the hon. member's riding.

MR. WHICHER: They cannot afford it, Mr. Speaker. The municipalities in my part of the country simply cannot afford it, unless the government helps them out to a certain extent.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What, a summer resort like the hon. member's?

MR. WHICHER: I want to go on record good and hard for that.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of the riding of Brantford would be very happy if, through the services of this new commission, we will be able to have our Grand River cleaned up. As hon. members know, I have spoken on many occasions about this. The "grand river" today is nothing more or less than an open sewer. Instead of getting better, it is getting worse. We have industry spewing sewage there. And, of course, I have to admit that from the City of Brantford we are spewing raw sewage into the Grand River from 50,000 people.

MR. EDWARDS: Louder, please.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member for Brantford wants to "soft pedal" that part of it.

MR. GORDON: And as I said, the people would be very, very happy to know that this is going to be cleaned up.

Just last week I had some citizens telling me that the appearance and the flavour of phenol has again become apparent. You know, we get all kinds of flavours in our water at Brantford in summertime. Phenol has again made its appearance, I think it comes from Galt, and from some plant on the Conestogo River. It does not take very much of that kind of chemical to flavour the water noticeably.

However, as I said, we would be very, very happy if this will clean up our Grand River, and we will once again have a river that is fit to swim in, fish in, and so on. In the summertime we have a water commission in Brantford, and they go around putting up signs along the river: *This River is Polluted*. You cannot swim in it, you cannot do anything about it, but you can smell it. We take our drinking water supply out of that river. Of course, it is treated, you know, and is very palatable after it is treated. But, again, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of Brantford will be very, very happy indeed if this is going to be a means of cleaning up the Grand River.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. G. LAVERGNE (Russell): Mr. Speaker, in rising, I do so with a feeling of humbleness, yet one of great pride and thankfulness in the knowledge of the opportunities offered to one, such as I, to enter this House and to endeavour to contribute in some small way, I hope, to a way of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of adding my congratulations to the many which have preceded me on the fact that you have been chosen to be the Speaker of this hon. House. Knowing you as I do, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that your fairness and the dignity that you will lend to this honourable House will be remarkable.



In passing, I should like to draw the attention of this House to an article which is headed:

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

*February 27, 1931.*

The Rev. A. W. Downer was appointed minister of the Church of the Epiphany, St. Clair Ave.

There is a reason, I am sure, why such dignity and decorum is installed in that hon. Chair.

Mr. Speaker, in touching on some of the points to which I have listened in this hon. House, I am reminded of that which was told to me just a short year ago, when I had the privilege of entering this House, by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) when he said: "A member enters this House and he feels his way around, getting experience before he hits out."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out, in enumerating some of those things which I have noted, that I have listened here with great interest, and I believe hon. members of this House will agree that I have not said too much, but having listened, I have learned that even the hon. leader of the Opposition rises in his place in this House, and says he does not remember from one day to another that which transpires.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Opposition, notably the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the CCF Party (Mr. MacDonald), who I am sorry to see is not in his seat, and I have noted that both of them have said in this House that in the Speech from the Throne they did not find any "meat".

I can only suggest that, if that is the fact, they must be vegetarians because, Mr. Speaker, legislation such as was discussed this afternoon, and approved unanimously, is definitely legislation for the human betterment of this province.

I am reminded also of certain incidents during the last campaign, and the

"wild and woolly" promises made by those who were contesting the election. Mr. Speaker, the platform of the Opposition was aptly named by the hon. Prime Minister when he said that it was "political driftwood," and just "brought together in a hurry."

In my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many people in this province, that platform was conceived in desperation, nourished on broken promises, and dedicated to the proposition that you can "fool some of the people all of the time." It was their hope in this particular election that they would fool enough of the people of Ontario to regain power.

In speaking along those lines, I would like to make some reference to matters which have been before this House. In doing so, I would like to touch briefly on reform institutions and training schools in the Province of Ontario. I say that, because I have had the opportunity of seeing the operation of the Alfred Boys' Training School. It is not in my riding, but in the riding of Prescott.

Mr. Speaker, surrounding municipalities such as ours each year take turns in providing sports or what we call a "field day" for the boys who are there. I have had the opportunity of seeing Brother George, who is in charge of the school. That particular institution is definitely one which can be looked up to as being definitely a credit to the system we enjoy in Ontario.

I wish to point out that after the boys go through there and after receiving their training and education in this particular institution, many become employed in high civil service positions, and other positions of importance. I wanted only to touch on that briefly, so far as it concerns my riding, which is so close.

We oftentimes hear, from the Opposition, reference made insofar as aid is concerned to the municipalities. We have had men, even in our own Party and in the Opposition, who will tell this House that they are the mayors of certain municipalities, or reeve, or what-

ever it may be. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in standing in my place and saying that I am the mayor of the municipality of Eastview, which has a population of more than 20,000 souls.

In making reference to municipal affairs or municipalities, and how they are being treated today, I would point out to you that as mayor of our municipality for a dozen years, and interested in municipal affairs, I well remember the dark and dreary days of the former administration when you had to come to Toronto to ask for a handout. Today, this government knows the plight of the municipalities, and is endeavouring to meet that plight in the most humanitarian manner possible.

I well remember the days, when, if we wanted to get anything, we could not say "good day" to our neighbour, because we were under what they called "supervision." I make reference to that simply for the reason that one of the oft-mentioned statements by the hon. leader of the Opposition is that you "cannot comb your hair without permission from the Municipal Board." I well remember the days when we could not say "good day" to our neighbour without first getting permission from the representative they sent down from that government, and it is only since this government came into power that the clouds have been rolled back, and the sunshine is permitted to shine down on municipalities throughout the Province of Ontario.

MR. WHICHER: How is the tax rate now, compared to what it was 12 years ago?

MR. LAVERGNE: I would answer the hon. member in this way: our tax rate is no higher as the people have much more, and more equitable service than we ever had before.

MR. WHICHER: Very well answered.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: And they have sewers.

MR. LAVERGNE: We have sewers and water works and everything else that goes with good living.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is due to economical administration.

MR. LAVERGNE: During the last session, I was accused of walking along the path and saying those things which were expected of me. Mr. Speaker, just as long as the hon. Prime Minister gives the administration he is giving today, I will walk that path and say those things, because in doing so, I will be doing it for the benefit of the people of Ontario.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): I thought the hon. Prime Minister was reading, but he heard that alright.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, I listen to you, too.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The hon. Prime Minister was listening to that quite intently.

MR. LAVERGNE: I really appreciate these interruptions and I would ask the Opposition to continue them every two or three minutes, because I get the opportunity of taking a drink of water.

MR. MacDONALD: Water is alright if it is taken in the right spirit.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Find out how many of the people have sewers in the township.

MR. LAVERGNE: I just want to make one reference to a phrase which I believe the hon. leader of the CCF Party has copied from the hon. leader of the Opposition, I heard it so often during the last session, I was surprised, as I thought it was copyrighted. But I understand it was not, and the leader of the CCF Party took it over.

MR. MacDONALD: It was unconscious stealth, I assure you.

MR. LAVERGNE: If the hon. member would speak a little louder, perhaps I can answer him.

MR. MacDONALD: It was unconscious stealth.

MR. LAVERGNE: If the hon. member is unconscious, I would say he has not been revived since he entered this House. Those words are "window dressing". When they make reference to "window dressing", I will agree with it in this respect, that if there is "window dressing" in the Province of Ontario, it is because the hon. Prime Minister and this government have opened the windows and shown the public what they are doing for their benefit, and that, Mr. Speaker, is because those windows are the great municipalities of the urban and rural sections of this province.

Those windows have been opened so the people of Ontario can see what is going on. That is one of the reasons why today I support this government. It is not the same method as adopted by the Opposition, because their actions are conceived behind drawn blinds and closed windows. "Secret information" is right.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened during all of this debate, and, as I said at the outset, with great intent, because I was most anxious to see what these hon. members had to offer. Since I have been listening, I would say that the hon. member for York South "takes the cake", because I have never seen a more persistent person, nor one who cannot recognize the truth when he comes face to face with it. I would like to mention that the Party criticism and sly insults which have been hurled across this floor prompts me to remind the hon. member that this world of ours sometimes places a high penalty upon leadership. People living in the white light of prominence are oftentimes the subject of ridicule and jealous jibes.

MR. MacDONALD: Do I have to pay for this advice?

HON. MR. NICKLE: No, but it is too bad the hon. member will not accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. LAVERGNE: I appreciate the interruption, because it gives me an opportunity to take a drink of water.

Certain people have a natural affinity for throwing stones, just as little boys like to throw stones at objects which are prominent. I like to place the leader of the CCF Party in the category of a little boy throwing stones at someone who is prominent, because not only I and this government, but the people of Ontario will agree that in the person of the hon. Prime Minister we have someone who really is prominent.

MR. MacDONALD: A quarter of them thought so.

MR. LAVERGNE: I well remember in our own municipality—in the riding I represent—the plight of the schools under a former administration, and if I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, even should I be praising this government, I have no alternative but to tell the truth, and to say that this government has done a wonderful job for the schools.

The grants which are given in this day and age are what is keeping the schools together. We all know the concept of education that those in the Opposition had in the past, and it was far from effecting any improvements in the schools.

I would like to turn my attention at this particular time to a matter that concerns me greatly and is of prime importance to the people of my riding. From now on I would like to speak about that which my people term the forgotten county, the County of Russell.

It may interest you to know that for administrative purposes we are united with the County of Prescott. Fate decreed more than 100 years ago that we be thus united, so whether it is justice that we need, or administration that we seek, we must leave our own Russell and journey to the tiny Town of L'Original in Prescott County.

Mr. Speaker, no part of Russell is further than 50 miles from the St. Lawrence, with many parts of it within



30 miles, as the crow flies, from the great waterway. We live in Russell, which is only half an hour away, if we had the roads to the St. Lawrence River. Less than 50 miles away from Russell, some day, ships from India and cargoes from the Persian Gulf will be commonplace; textiles from Manchester will compete on the St. Lawrence channel with coffee from Rio. Baltic manufacturers' products will be going right past our neighbouring counties, but this will do us no good, because in our riding the highway situation is one that should be looked into.

MR. WHICHER: Ask the government, they will give it to you.

MR. LAVERGNE: For the information of the hon. member I might say—and I am sure he is aware of it—that back in 1937—

MR. WHICHER: No, that is too far back.

MR. LAVERGNE: You would not remember that, but I would suggest that you check up a little on it and find out that back in 1937 what your government did was to promise that 2,000 miles of road would be incorporated into a highway system. I will agree that no doubt they took them over, but the proof is there, that they never did a thing about it, they just took them over. It took this government, when it came into power, to start improving these roads a former government had taken over.

MR. MacDONALD: It took your government 10 years to fill the potholes in your main street.

MR. LAVERGNE: Would the hon. member repeat that?

MR. MacDONALD: You heard it.

MR. LAVERGNE: I am hard of hearing. I say that in all sincerity.

MR. MALONEY: The hon. member does not remember what he said.

HON. MR. FROST: What they did or did not do, we put the road there.

MR. MacDONALD: They had to have a Conservative elected to fill the potholes in the main street. I know, because I had to drive through them.

HON. MR. FROST: The CCF formerly had 35 hon. members and now they have only 3.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): There is another day coming.

MR. LAVERGNE: If the hon. member will let me know when he is through with his speech, I will continue.

MR. MacDONALD: Have you had your drink?

MR. LAVERGNE: I have, and I appreciate it when you interrupt. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be fair in this, as I try to be in all things, but the responsibility lies with the government which preceded ours, for the simple reason they did little or nothing to bring forth the potentialities of Russell County.

What do we need in Russell? Let me first of all tell you what Russell has. In the matter of transportation, it has 3 railways passing through it, the Canadian Pacific short line operates through the northern part of the riding but does not stop. The Canadian National Railway bisects my county, and it may interest my listeners to know that we have one of the finest stretches of track in Canada, in the County of Russell. For 15 miles, or more, there is a stretch of track through what we call the "La Mer Bleu", a spectacular tangent almost without comparison in Ontario.

Even this speedway does us no good, for the trains do not stop. It seems so characteristic of our county, "the forgotten county". The New York Central from Ottawa passes through the Town of Russell and on to Cornwall. I would ask the indulgence of the hon. members of the surrounding counties should I touch some of their municipalities, but

it is just that in building up my case I find myself in a position where I must do it.

I would like to digress for a moment to say that it came to me as a shock, to learn the New York Central had succeeded in dropping its passenger service, since Cornwall has taken on its new importance on the waterway. I am sure the traffic passenger-wise between Ottawa and Cornwall must be considerable; thus, Mr. Speaker, Russell is the "forgotten county" again. Instead of a new, fast Diesel car, a safe, clean operation which would put Cornwall only a scant 50 minutes from Ottawa, we have no service at all by rail.

So, as far as passenger service is concerned, people going to Cornwall have to take a bus, and to make matters worse, they barely touch the geographical limits of Russell as they go about 30 miles out of their way via Morrisburg to Cornwall. So, once again, we are the "forgotten county".

Either the New York Central should be approached to put a Diesel dayliner on, or the line should be abandoned. I feel sure if the New York Central was urged to try dayliner service and run trains to and from Ottawa 4 times a day, on a round trip basis, the passenger service would flow and flow quickly.

If the New York Central does not see fit to improve their trackage, then I say rip it up, rip it up, Mr. Speaker, and lay a fine new straight highway down the right-of-way between Ottawa and Cornwall.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if a man wants to go to Cornwall by car he might have to go east to the Province of Quebec and then come back west on Highway No. 2, or he could go down to Morrisburg and then travel approximately 30 miles over a winding, if picturesque, road to Cornwall.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no direct route between Ottawa and Cornwall, and the waterway is every day and every hour making the waterfront more important

I heartily agree that the St. Lawrence shoreline should have superhighways, but I disagree most emphatically that there should be only horse-and-buggy mud trails for "forgotten" Russell.

In qualifying that statement, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this to the Opposition—and if they want to be honest about it they will repeat what I say—that the burden placed on this government after all their promises for road construction, and the number of miles it took over, this government over the past years has had to assume the responsibility, and make highways out of roads they took over, and they have made some fine roads out of them.

Mr. Speaker, I say if the New York Central does not want this right-of-way, then let us parallel it with a new highway from Ottawa to Cornwall.

I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan), and to thank him on behalf of the people of Russell, for the splendid new Highway No. 17. Not so long ago this was a winding and badly-paved strip of road; today one can travel from Ottawa to Montreal over a splendid boulevard of pavement and I am told—and I know it to be a fact, Mr. Speaker—that many of the scenes along the Ottawa River where the road parallels the mighty sweep of the river are equal to anything the St. Lawrence has to offer.

Under the benign regime of the hon. Prime Minister we are constructing useful by-passes. On those Rockland and Hawkesbury by-passes, one may drive through this fertile country without experiencing any delay. I am sure the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) would join me in sounding the praises of this fine new highway.

I am not ungrateful, Mr. Speaker; I am hopeful. I do not want to think that we, in Russell, are only entitled to one road, and that road down the easterly fringe of our county. I am not jealous, nor do I begrudge other counties their good roads. I merely say that Russell has been neglected for too long, and it

is time that official eyes be turned in our direction.

Mr. Speaker, what do we need? What do we want most? How **can** we get back on the map? I would say that can best be answered, insofar as we are concerned, in three words, Mr. Speaker, "roads, roads, roads." We want to get out of the horse-and-buggy days, in our area.

There are some old French villages on the New York Central, only a short

distance from Ottawa, but they might as well be buried somewhere up in the north. If we only had a few good roads that would connect this county of mine with Ottawa or Rockland, we would achieve a great deal.

THE SPEAKER: It being 6.00 of the clock I do now leave the chair.

It being 6.00 of the clock the House took recess.









ONTARIO

# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Evening Session

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lavergne,<br>Mr. Wardrope, Mr. Innes, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Price, Mr. Root ..... | 587 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Spooner, agreed to .....  | 625 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....   | 625 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

MR. LAVERGNE: Mr. Speaker, when we rose for the dinner hour, I was endeavouring to place before the House, that which I thought was pertinent to my constituency, and to the people whom I represent in this House. At the outset, I endeavoured to qualify my remarks—and I am endeavouring to be fair in this—by placing the responsibility where it originally belonged, and to point out that this government, since those dark days, have tried to pick up the slack, and it is only since then that any recognition has been given to my particular riding.

In speaking, Mr. Speaker, my intention was to draw attention of those who have within their control the extensions of services throughout the province of Ontario. I stand to be corrected, but in speaking of that particular instance, I believe the hon. leader of the C.C.F. Party interjected some remark about "roads." I just did not "get it," but, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I do endeavour to approach all problems in a businesslike way, while the only thing which can be said about the hon. leader of the C.C.F. Party is that he approaches all problems with an open mouth and a closed mind.

MR. MACDONALD: Brilliant. I am overwhelmed, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member for Russell is quite right.

MR. LAVERGNE: Oftentimes it takes a vacant mind to be overwhelmed.

MR. MACDONALD: The mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse.

MR. LAVERGNE: Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to point out that if we had a few good roads in our county, which would connect my county with Ottawa or with Cornwall, we would have achieved a great deal. Please do not misunderstand me, I am as proud of my county as any hon. member can possibly be of his. I love it all, from Eastview through to the present boundary on the east; from the northern limits on the Ottawa river to the southern section. I only mention some of these municipalities, and towns—all important in their own way—which are cut off from Ottawa, from Montreal, from Cornwall, from anywhere, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of roads.

If we had good roads in my county, we could open up the whole county. We could give new business to gasoline stations, to merchants. We would give to the interior of Russell a new perspective, a new hope, a new ambition. We would open up new automobile agencies, new chain stores, new this and new that, new everything, Mr. Speaker. What Russell needs is a new lift—a new look.

MR. MACDONALD: And a new member.

MR. LAVERGNE: A new life; and, while some hon. member in Opposition may say "a new member", let me say, in all sincerity, that if a new member would bring Russell what the people want, I would be the first to step aside.

MR. MACDONALD: And you may have to step aside soon.

MR. LAVERGNE: I am aware that the demands on the Ontario Government are many and varied. I realize that heavy is the burden our friendly hon. Minister of Highways carries, but surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not asking too much, to ask for these roads.

Open up Russell. Give us a new chance, for not only will it bring thousands of tourists on Sunday afternoons, over summer week-ends, but throughout the year. A new highway, a new series of concrete arteries would pulsate the breath of commerce through our villages. It would pump the spectacular dollars of the tourist trade into long-forgotten Russell. New roads would shed up-to-date light on our fine old county upon the tourists. It would afford our long-deserving people in the county a chance to get out and see the world. The people of the grand old county of Russell are a long way from any metropolitan county, by any arterial road. A new road to Ottawa, from Cornwall, would cut by an hour or more the travelling time to such places as the federal capital.

Roads would permit businessmen to tender on new contracts and new capital to flow. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to stress my case at further length. The population of Russell is made up, in large part, by those speaking the two great tongues, the French and the English, who work side by side, with the highest respect for one another. Not only, Mr. Speaker, do they work and live together, but they unite to support the cause of good government in Ontario. They are loyal people, who have faithfully endorsed the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we are thrilled by the new St. Lawrence Seaway and by what it is going to mean to Canada. We feel that we are the county of destiny. To the north are the suburbs of Ottawa, which are steadily eating into our county perimeter. To the south, is the Seaway progress. Either way, prosperity beckons. Let us offer the historic

county of Russell a chance to share in this great new boom. There is an opportunity to help Canada achieve its glorious destiny. We in Russell, Mr. Speaker, are only asking for our fair share of the Canada of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to place before this hon. House the requirements of my particular riding, and I want to say this—and I do so in all sincerity—it may surprise the hon. leader of the Opposition to realize it is he to whom I am speaking, but I wish great success in his present position.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, I am getting too old for that now.

MR. LAVERGNE: It is new to me, Mr. Speaker, but it is sincere.

MR. WHICHER: It sounds like it, anyway.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would the hon. member for Bruce be careful; he might be an "overnight guest", too.

MR. LAVERGNE: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the hon. leader of the Opposition accepts what I say in the spirit in which it is meant. First of all, he must be sincere, knowing that for many years to come he will be sitting on the Opposition benches. I would like to offer to him the best of everything.

It has been a revelation to me, sir, to hear the two parties quarreling amongst themselves, because I think it was the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Canada who said that a "C.C.F'er was just a Liberal in a hurry."

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Who said that?

MR. LAVERGNE: But in saying this it was recalled to my mind, but I say it for one particular reason. I came into this House one year ago, and I say this to all hon. members, regarding those who have given all of their time, who have spent practically a lifetime in the service of this great province—and I say this in all sincerity, Mr.



Speaker — that I was amazed at the amount of the indemnity hon. members receive. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because to hon. members who are sitting in Opposition, and remaining in that position for the number of years some of them have, I take off my hat as I feel they have been woefully underpaid. I say that without levity, Mr. Speaker, other than to say it is too bad the people of this great province do not know that so many hon. members devote so much of their life to good government, whether it be in Opposition or in the government, and receive so little. I think if the people of Ontario knew the sacrifices these hon. members have to make, and are making, the respect and admiration for each one, whether he be with the government or in the Opposition, would be heightened considerably.

In resuming my seat, I wish to thank each hon. member of this House for the attention he has paid to me and I conclude my remarks with animosity towards none, but admiration towards all.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, may I offer my congratulations to you on your promotion to that august office that you now hold. I am mindful of the great service that you have given all during your life to date, first to your church, secondly to your country in time of war, and last but certainly not least, as a very valiant servant in this great province of ours in her legislative halls. You lend dignity to that office, and I think the hon. members of this House are to be complimented on their choice, and the hon. Prime Minister should be complimented on his choice. There is something which I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, and I think you should achieve credit for, that is the attendants you have in these buildings, from the head ones down to the page boys. Coming from the northern part of the province I perhaps notice these things more than a resident of Toronto would, but I am always shown the greatest courtesy and the greatest kindness, and I wish through you, Mr.

Speaker, to extend to your staff my thanks for the many attentions they give to me very often in my blundering way through the House, not knowing the exact routine. They are always kind and helpful in their assistance and I think they deserve the thanks of every hon. member here.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Debate. I have not had a chance before to congratulate them, Mr. Speaker. The mover, the hon. member for Renfrew South, I believe is going to rise to be a great debater in this House. I like his style, his rough and ready tactics, if necessary, and his smooth, *sauve* way, if that is called for. I want to compliment him on the wonderful job he did in that speech.

In regard to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, I remember the leader of the opposition mentioning the pile of books he had in front of him. Mr. Speaker, if I had the grasp of the English language and the vocabulary which he has, and the facility with which he uses it, I would be pleased to listen to him for hours, if the pile of books was twice as high as the one he had. He did a wonderful job and I want to congratulate him in his reply to that speech.

I want also to congratulate others, even in the face of taking an extra two or three minutes. I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Planning and Development on his promotion, a gentleman who will grace that office with a great deal of credit, having the ability to make a success of it. I also want to congratulate an old friend and schoolmate of mine, the new hon. Attorney-General. I realize he already is making a name for himself in that office, and will continue to do so. I wish him all success in that very important position in this province.

I want to congratulate our new hon. Minister of Highways. I cannot help but think when I go in to see him with his winsome smile, when you come out of the office whether you have achieved anything or not, Mr. Speaker, you still have a deep regard for him and have a soft spot in your heart for him. I have

the feeling if one perseveres long enough he will find he at last will open that great heart of his and will see that you get the necessary things for your constituency in this province. I congratulate him on his appointment.

Also I congratulate the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity, a man who is a "natural" in that position, a great bringer of glad tidings to all parts of the province, and a tremendous public relations exponent. He is a man who will do that office a great deal of credit. I offer congratulations to all new hon. members including new hon. members of the Opposition. I think our Opposition this time is of a very high calibre. I have noticed many of the speakers in the Opposition benches and I want to congratulate them. I think they have done extremely well and I think they have in their ranks some excellent debaters.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, our ranks too contain real gentlemen, who are not always unwilling to give credit to the Opposition. That is what makes our party such a great party, and our Prime Minister such a great Prime Minister, and one that will continue for a great many years to lead the affairs of this province.

May I also congratulate the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions on his return to health. I do not think there is anybody in the House who has not a place in his heart for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. That was one of the sad moments of my stay here this session, when I saw him so bitterly attacked. It was very uncalled for, I believe, and when I consider his great life and his service to this country and this province, I have nothing but the highest regard for him and the greatest gratitude. I am glad he has been spared to be with us and I hope he will be with us for many years in the position he holds now.

In conclusion—the conclusion of my congratulations, that is—my congratulations must also go to the hon. Prime Minister on the tremendous vote of confidence shown him in the last election at the polls.

I have made the statement before in this House, that I believe our hon. Prime Minister is responsible for 70 per cent. at least, of the hon. members in this House. I am speaking for myself in my own constituency, and I know that throughout this province he is held in the highest regard because he has built up in this province a feeling that anything he has to do with is honest through and through. You cannot get a finer tribute than that in public life, and I doubt whether any man in the future will ever hold the place in the hearts of the people of Ontario that our hon. Prime Minister does today.

I want to thank him for the things he has done in my part of northwestern Ontario. Very often I am amazed at some of the things that come about which we have longed and hoped for. Certainly at this session we have seen the fulfilment of a great many things we have hoped for for a great many years.

May I just read to you at the commencement of my remarks part of the submission in the brief which we gave to the Gordon Commission on Canadian Economic Prospects, because I think it depicts better than I can in any way just what that great northwestern Ontario means to this province, what its people are like and what they are accomplishing.

For many years in southern and eastern Ontario it was thought to be a barren land which could produce no wealth for this province, but that has been proven a fallacy and we are at last, I believe, coming into our own.

This was headed, Mr. Speaker, "So Much By So Few."

Northwestern Ontario, 212,000 square miles in area, comprises more than half of the province of Ontario. In width it extends more than 440 miles from Algoma and Cochrane to the Manitoba boundary; north and south, it stretches from Minnesota and the fresh waters of Lake Superior to the silent tundra and saline tide-waters of Hudson Bay. It is one of the richest but least known segments of Canada.

In the lap of the Pre-Cambrian Shield, it has enormous stores of precious and base metal ores, gold, silver, uranium, iron, nickel, copper, zinc and lithium. Much of its treasure is undeveloped; most of its mineral areas remain to be thoroughly explored.

In forest resources, it possesses some of Canada's greatest accessible stands of conifers and hardwoods, basis of its great and growing forest products industry.

I noticed the leader of the CCF Opposition today talking about the forest cover and the denuding of our forests. If he would only come up with me and go through the bush—not ride in an automobile—but go through the bush and see the forest cover, I am sure he would see it is not barren land. But perhaps he is a little mentally barren when he makes a remark about the forest floor being denuded. We are not afraid of that for years to come in our part of the country.

In these cities, towns and organized townships there are approximately 200,000 people. They are the type of people who are going to bring these great natural resources to the place where they will be producing wealth for this entire country of ours and therefore all these things that have been done for our districts and that will be done, I am sure, are going to return tenfold or one hundredfold in wealth anything that this province may invest in them.

The Department of Highways is one department which can help us as much or more than any other department of this government.

A year ago this government started building access roads. I well remember the Nakina to Geraldton Road—that road gave people the first access road that they had had in 35 years, to a main highway. That, today, is going to produce a great deal of wealth, about which I will tell you when I come to the mining part of my talk. The Seagram-Caramet Road that is now being built from No. 11 Highway down to Manitouwadge, will make available

a main highway to those people who are going to take the ores from the great Geco Mines and Wilroy Mines, and when one goes down to the Manitouwadge area and sees two railway lines, the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. running into the middle of the woods, to these great mines and the town sites being built that will probably house 5,000 or more, people, it shows that a tremendous advance is being made in the North country.

Highway 17—the great Trans-Canada Highway—which the Minister of Highways tells me will have a tremendous amount of work done on it this year—with many others—is going to create a great reservoir of wealth—some 40 million Americans to the south of us will be brought by this road into our country—at Sault Ste. Marie and clean over through the North country out to Fort Frances territory, and back to the States, at International Falls these American people will leave here millions and millions of dollars in tourist wealth.

That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the things that we believe is a possibility before many years have gone by, the completion of Highway 17 from Sault Ste. Marie to International Falls—the Great Lake Superior Route.

But there is something that I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Highways, which I believe, could speed up this Highway work a great deal. Mind you, I have no serious complaint about the Highways Department, because I believe that they have efficient engineers who are trying to do a real job in this province—a great staff of men. I know in my own territory I have had the greatest co-operation from them; during this winter there was an example for the whole of this country and the United States to see how the snow was cleaned off these roads and the salt was put down. Constantly keeping our roads in great condition for spring. They are doing a wonderful job. However, I am deeply concerned about the uncompleted state of our highways contracts in my district right now—in the uncompleted state of the



Nipigon highway—the Marathon Highway—the Highway to Nakina to Geraldton Highway—the Seagram to Caramet Highway and the Trans-Canada and Atikokan Highway.

Now the Dominion Government called a Conference a short time ago, with the province, because of the slow progress that was being made with the paving of the Trans-Canada Highway, under this agreement with the Dominion of Canada, they assured that half the cost of paving Trans-Canada Highway would be available—and it is a good agreement. The trouble is that there still seems to be a long time lag between the time that a contract is let and the time the road is built. I don't know the reasons in other parts of the country but I do know one of the main reasons in the North West country Mr. Speaker. I have had it from the Minister that this is going to be corrected, and I am very glad to hear it. They do not let their road contracts early enough in the year. I am told that the main reason is that they do not know how much money is available until the Parliamentary Session meets in February, and the money is voted in March or April. That means that the engineering, and the calling of tenders and all the other necessities are done with and after that the contractor gets his job—probably about the end of June or even later.

Now I have seen paving contracts in our country called on the 21st of October, Mr. Speaker, and in our country, what chance has a contractor to do anything about paving, after that date? That means that he won't do it until July of the year following the year in which he is awarded the contract. That system is not good enough for North-West Ontario. I believe a way to correct this, Mr. Speaker—and I throw this out as a suggestion only—knowing it would entail a change in the fiscal year ending. I wish to comment on the idea of making the fiscal year coincide with the end of the calendar year, as is done in computing income tax. Naturally, my viewpoint is based along highway administrative lines which would not necessarily

be acceptable from the over-all provincial angle—I know that. However, highway work is of major importance so far as our part of the province is concerned Mr. Speaker, and this is because our construction season is comparatively limited and our work, in general, is just as seasonal in type as farming. This, of course, applies to the north-west parts of the province in which I am particularly interested. The chief point I have in mind concerns road construction and the awarding of contracts, which I think should be started sufficiently early in the calendar year to enable operators to take advantage of the full working season. Present conditions preclude this in most cases and contractors cannot get started—even under the best circumstances—before July or later. The quality of the work would be much improved if contracts were awarded early in the year, but when they are awarded as at present, the result is to complicate matters for all concerned, and the net result is that operations are more costly to the public than they need to be, because, in the long run, the public pays for the seasonal carry-over. The contractor has to make two starts—and the carry-over problem in itself is a source of annoyance and uncertainty for the Provincial Treasury officials as well as for the direct highway finance administration.

Today these factors are further accentuated for three reasons—first the tremendous increase in the volume of work and the necessary funds involved; two, the fact that funds for highway construction now have to be directly approved and allotted by the Legislature in advance of the annual construction programme; and thirdly, the fact that now, more accurate financial forecasts are required, and the Highway Department has become—and rightly in my opinion—involved in an extensive programme of planning and pre-engineering estimates, in order to supply this capital financial forecast. It is my thought that, in order to take advantage of our shorter season, the whole cycle could be simplified considerably, in advance. Instead

of the financial balance being struck on March 31st, which is close to the beginning of the working year, it might be struck on the thirty-first of December, when a final estimate could be concluded and contracts advertised and awarded. On a time basis alone, this will prove a saving in cost to the public. That is probably the most important angle Mr. Speaker, and as I have said before, I don't know how practical my idea would be for other departments, but in terms of volume in the Highway Department, in general, I would say this is a majority angle and a most constructive suggestion. I could give you some idea of the contracts and how they stand for last year in our area Mr. Speaker, but I won't take the time of the House on that, tonight.

One other point I would like to mention is in regard to automobile and truck licences, Mr. Speaker. In my city, Port Arthur, we have one licence issuer,—his commission and everything else, amounted in 1954—I haven't the 1955 figures—to about \$5,500, and out of that he is supposed to run his office, rent, help, his one salary, and everything else. Now we get to the end of December and there are 12,000 automobiles—I think there are that many in our city—and an edict goes out that everyone has to have a new licence by the 31st of January. He calls in a couple of girls—that is all he can afford to hire—and we have got lines of people, 60, 70, a 100—standing waiting for their licence plates—many of them have to go away and come back again the next day. He is located in a store which closes on Wednesday afternoon, and people come in from the country and they cannot get their licences on a Wednesday afternoon. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is rather a poor way—not a very constructive way of issuing licences. Everybody is frantic about the deadline, January 31st, then about the 3rd week in January an edict comes out from the Department that the time has been extended to February 29th, so the people who need to get new licences think “we have a little more time” and so we start again. Then I get after the

Issuer and want to know why he hasn't got all these people fixed up more quickly and I find that if he could put enough people on his Staff he could get them fixed up, but if he did that, he wouldn't make enough out of his year's salary to keep himself in coffee. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, that is something which should be gone into and I am wondering if it would be too far out of the realm of possibility that the people could start buying their new licences in October or November or sometime before the end of the year—and our Issuers be paid a decent salary, and if they need help the government pay for it. It is a constructive suggestion. It is a condition which causes a great deal of annoyance to our people at the Lakehead, and perhaps some of the other Members have had the same experience. Anyway, I think there may be better way of issuing licences for automobiles and trucks. We have a tremendous number of trucks up there and these fellows come in from the bush and they want to get their licence on the day they come in. If they have to go away and come in a second time, it is annoying and costly. This is the suggestion I would like to hand to the Minister to see if there could be some corrective measure taken in that respect.

Now just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a couple of items on pulp and paper—the Minister is here and I want to congratulate him on the good job he is doing.

May I say that some of the criticism that has been levelled at him in this House, is most unfair. I came into this House at the same time as he did and I have worked constantly with him and I know the time, effort, thought and worry that he is putting into that position and if any mistakes are made it certainly will not be because of his not trying to do the best he could. It hurt me when I heard remarks made about him questioning his position in the department but some of the things which will come about before many months will prove that he is using discretion and a great deal of thought, and a lot of good brain power in the

job and you will find some great improvements made in our pulp and paper industry in this province due to our Minister of Lands and Forests.

I also want to congratulate, and thank his staff for the kindness they have always shown to me and the co-operation and courtesy they have accorded me. We are intensely interested in the department because the growth in that industry has been phenomenal. Lately our pulp and paper mills have been carrying out extensive programmes which entail \$150 million to \$200 million of capital expenditure and will provide new jobs in both the mill and woods for thousands more people. To give you some idea of these tremendous programmes the Minnesota and Ontario Paper Company at Kenora and Fort Frances are spending some \$42 million in expansion. The Dryden Paper Company at Dryden—perhaps the hon. Minister could give these figures better than I could—the Dryden Paper Company is spending over \$20 million in extension and expansion. The Great Lakes Paper Company another \$25 million in an extension programme and these are all in the process of being carried out and have been commenced within the last two years. The St. Lawrence Corporation at Red Rock, \$28 million for an extension programme, 100 new homes and a recreation centre costing half-a-million dollars, and things of that kind. There is a strong likelihood, as the hon. Minister has told you, that the Newfoundland company will build a new pulp and paper mill at Sioux Lookout, spending \$50 million and more. It is not in the realm of impossibility, Mr. Speaker, that new cities and towns will follow from these tremendous developments. When our St. Lawrence deep waterway gets up to our Lakehead ports we will be an ocean port open to every other ocean port in the world and can you imagine the tremendous potentialities that brings to us lessening of the freight rate on our wheat probably 5 cents a bushel and on our iron ore and everything else. That is something that has been done in the life of this government, it was talked

about for years but it took our hon. Prime Minister in conjunction with the Federal Government, I do not know how small a part they had to play but it was a great achievement to see that great development of 2,100,000 horsepower and a great seaway opening our Lakehead to every other ocean port in the world started at last. A tremendous development.

I think this would be a suggestion that might help clean up the forest floor. Wherever there are Crown lots and access roads operated by the Department of Highways or the Department of Mines, all downed timber lying on the ground that is dry and suitable for fuel wood, the public should be allowed to gather it without payment on the condition that it is not offered for sale but is for personal use only. It is my opinion that will make for good forestry practice and create good public relations. In these northern areas a lot of these people need fuel and it would be a good way of getting it to them and cleaning up the forest floor. They could gather it themselves under the supervision of a supervisor who would see that forest fires did not start. Any of you who have been at Geco must have seen, I do not know how many cords of wood all piled up on the Geco Mine site, a tremendous pile, hundreds of cords and it is all rotting away because no one uses it. Most of the people there are using propane gas and that is one example of how that wood is wasted. In other places where people are living and who are using stove wood and if this were made available to them, I think it would help clean up the forests and also give them wood and they would appreciate it, very, very much.

The hon. Minister told you the other day about some of the things he is trying to do. One of the most important things that the Department of Lands and Forests and this government are trying to do, and I think it is an outstanding thing is to try and induce wood industries in here without giving them large areas of timber under long leases. The hon. Minister and the government are trying to attract these industries on



the basis that the government gives them a guarantee of supplying them with a certain amount of wood each year in perpetuity. If that can be done, you see the tremendous growth there can be as far as our forests industries are concerned. In the past a great many large areas have been leased to pulp and paper companies and rightly so because, after all, they had to have great forest areas to raise the tremendous finances needed for this industry. In the future, if we could get away from that, and give Industries a government guarantee of timber in perpetuity, we would have a lot more timber available for more allied forest industries. That is a problem on which the hon. Minister and our government are working very hard and I wish them all success. I hope that when it is culminated that the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) will give them a pat on the back and tell them they are not all trying to pour money down the drain or into the pockets of those great United States capitalists that he is so fond of speaking about, but who have in the past been a great help to us in building our economy.

The mining picture, in our district, Mr. Speaker, is one that staggers the imagination. I suppose you get tired of hearing about these mines up our way but they are tremendous. I have a lighter in my pocket that was sent me by Steep Rock Iron mines and engraved on it is, "Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited, 1955, 2,260,555 tons of ore shipped," out of that great property during the season of 1955. You remember a few years ago when it was debatable in a lot of minds in this province that Steep Rock would be a success. The hon. member for Fort Frances—Rainy River could tell you a lot more about it than I can. In addition to Steep Rock next door we have a sister property alongside of it which shall by 1960 be producing 3 million tons to 4 million tons more of that ore, thereby supplying half the requirements of Inland Steel Company of the United States, a \$50 million programme going on now to bring it to production and that is one of the reasons we are so anxious to get that

gas pipe line through northern Ontario so that this ore can be processed into steel right in Canada.

I would like the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) to remember that the Canadian people are the ones who collect the money when this iron ore is processed into steel in Canada and we do not want the gas pipe line held up, if this is done we will have to continue shipping our raw materials out of this country, we are trying to get into the position where we can manufacture them by Canadians.

MR. MACDONALD: If you had listened to us that is the way you would have it now.

MR. WARDROPE: Some of the new properties that are of such interest to us, the Bruce Lake Iron Bay mines up near Red Lake have now 500,000,000 tons of ore proven and as soon as the gas pipe line is through they are going to process that ore under a new process superior to anything in the United States, this will be a \$50 million programme under a very reputable operating company of men famous in the business, the Moshers. The Lake Superior Iron, north of Nakina, 250,000,000 tons of ore already proved, and now they are trying to bring it up to half a billion tons and when they do, they will be asking this government for another 40 mile road northeast of Nakina to go from the C.N.R. main line to the property. They tell me there is a possibility of three new towns, one of 5,000 and two of 2,000 people, and the railway will be asked to put a spur in there to take out that tremendous body of ore which is now to the point where they figure it will be a tremendous financial success. Then we have properties such as Coldstream Copper, Nana Creek Lithium. In the paper I got tonight from Port Arthur it says that Coldstream is to open new levels. These are tremendous developments in the north country which is going to reflect down here in tremendous new mineral wealth.

There are a couple of other things I would like to mention which indicates the great forward looking programme

of this government. I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) for giving us the Lakehead University and, also, the increased grants to school children from \$4 to \$6. That is something which the Opposition must respect this government for and be grateful for.

Then there is a great new plan of old age security. Along with every other hon. member in the House I would like to see old age pensions raised. This government has done its fair share and now I think it is up to the senior government to come along and they can be assured we will meet any extra contribution they make, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the old age pension should be raised to \$60 a month.

MR. OLIVER: Providing the Federal Government pay it.

MR. WARDROPE: Well, the greatest portion of it, they should pay it because they have it, they are the ones who have the money in their pockets and you know it. They can pull the great fiscal lever or put the brakes on, unfortunately too often the latter.

MR. OLIVER: And they are paying most of it.

MR. WARDROPE: The services we are paying for would make that look very small. In my own city a great new old folks home is being built. I like to call them the "golden age homes" rather than old age homes, something to put a little gold in their pocket when there is silver in their hair would be timely, and a place for senior citizens to live in comfort and peace until the grim reaper comes along with that old scythe. That is what this government is doing, Mr. Speaker, things of that kind, they are not forgetting the disabled, the infirm and the aged and they have a great programme which is legislation and not just talk.

Now we come along with another great plan instituted by this government, national health insurance, which is one of the most difficult things to put into effect—one of the things this govern-

ment will see becomes a reality. I am all for it, and have always been, and it must include tuberculosis and the mentally infirm. If I might take a minute to read a report I am sure all the hon. members of the Opposition will like—it is from *Life* of January 23rd of this year—a quotation from President Truman's memoirs and he says:

"I have had some bitter disappointments as President, but the one that has troubled me most, in a personal way, has been the failure to defeat the organized opposition to a national compulsory health insurance programme.

"I have never been able to understand all the fuss some people make about government wanting to do something to improve and protect the health of the people. As early as I can remember I have been troubled by seeing so many sick people unable to get the care they needed because they and the community lacked the means. World War II had shown that the health of this nation was far from what it should be, and I decided that the time had come for the Federal Government to do something about it."

You notice he mentions the Federal Government, I would like to draw that to the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition because their Federal Government in the States is on the same plane of government as the Federal Government in Canada.

MR. OLIVER: There is a similarity.

MR. WARDROPE: Of course, under President Eisenhower it is much better.

"On November 19, 1945, I sent Congress a message recommending national compulsory health insurance through payroll and other deductions. Under the plan all citizens would be able to get medical and hospital service regardless of ability to pay. It was made clear that under such a programme people would remain free to choose their own physicians and hospitals, and that by removing the

financial barriers between patient and doctor there would be greater freedom of choice by the patient in selecting his physician.

"I cautioned the Congress against being frightened by the scare words 'socialized medicine.' I wanted no part of socialized medicine, and I knew the American people did not. I believed, and still do, that the majority of practicing physicians understand and approve the desire of the public for health security; and I felt that the views of the medical profession of the country were not expressed fairly by a small group who promoted lobbying to further their own interests."

MR. MacDONALD: Are you in favour of that programme?

MR. WARDROPE: Of which?

MR. MacDONALD: Of what you are just reading.

MR. WARDROPE: Not necessarily the one President Truman talks about, but I am in favour of national health insurance very much and always have been.

MR. MacDONALD: President Eisenhower is opposed to it and you said he was better than President Truman.

MR. WARDROPE: He is not opposed to it, he has a better way of doing it than the one Truman put forward. I do not appreciate so-called socialized medicine myself, because it is often unworkable, but when our plans come out you will see something that is going to be beneficial to every person in this province and it is not going to cost a fortune for people who really cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, in talking to the hon. member for York South and listening to him on his C.C.F. programme, and all those things that can be done by pulling money out of the air, I would just like to mention that I have two brothers-in-law who farm in Saskat-

chewan and, a most peculiar thing, there in the C.C.F. stronghold they have managed to stay true conservatives. I suppose after election day for the last few years they have said words that might put them nearer purgatory than they should be but they still carry on. I have been sending them reports of the Legislature here and the Debates. One of them wrote me the other day and said, "If any of the men in Ontario who are talking this CCF," what shall I say, circumlocution, should come out here and see for themselves. He sent me an article and I think it is worth reading and it is by Bruce Hutchinson in the *Christian Science Monitor*, so you know it is by a good man; and a good writer and thinker:

The plains of Saskatchewan, rolling out to an interminable, flat horizon, grow more wheat than any other Canadian province. They also produce a distinctive type of Canadian and a mental climate never to be confused with any other in the nation.

The fact that Saskatchewan has long maintained a socialist government, so-called, is no accident. It is the result of men's struggle to manage the surging fertility and huge crops of the prairie earth.

The autumn Saskatchewan, as the nation's chief granary, faces an old problem in a new version. The annual crop has been not only large but of high quality. Most of it remains piled up in every line elevator and farmer's barn, unsold.

The men who ploughed the dark soil last spring watched it turn green in summer and golden in the fall, and reaped it with high hopes, are now unable to turn their year's labour into cash.

Saskatchewan has seen that and worse things happen many times before. It has seen both markets and crops fall simultaneously in a combination of drought and depression, during the dreadful "thirties."

Out of this experience it has attempted in the guise of socialism, under a Cooperative Commonwealth



Federation government, to cure the age-old farmer's problem.

If the stranger comes to Saskatchewan expecting to find a revolutionary and strictly socialist society, he will be disappointed. The government of Premier T. C. (Tommy) Douglas—a Baptist minister, a bustling, friendly little man and a platform performer of extraordinary gifts—is the only Canadian government ever elected by the CCF and elected in the birthplace of that movement of protest against the depression.

But it is socialist only by label. It could not be otherwise in a farm province of small rural capitalists and tenacious individualists. The Douglas government began after World War II to implement the CCF's Regina Manifesto of advanced socialism. Experience and prosperity soon mellowed it and many socialist experiments were quietly liquidated.

Today the government is eager—and I want the hon. member for York South to listen to this, in reference to those terrible Americans putting money in our country which he so often talks about.

—today the government is eager to attract private capital to Saskatchewan, is promoting the development of newly found resources like gas, oil, and minerals, through private enterprise while concentrating its own energies on improved social services.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should look into the way the government here is protecting our interests, in comparison with the way the government of Saskatchewan is protecting Saskatchewan interests.

MR. WARDROPE: Mr. Speaker, they are following the good, old Conservative line in Saskatchewan. We gave them the lead in the first place—and then they saw the light.

MR. MacDONALD: Is that to say they are successful now because they are not Socialists?

MR. WARDROPE: No they are becoming Conservatives. Bruce Hutchison continues:

Mr. Douglas, once a red-hot socialist, in theory at least,—

Mr. MacDONALD: He still is.

MR. WARDROPE: That's what you think. This goes on:

—says he does not favour government ownership of anything for its own sake. He is interested only in results, as measured by the welfare of the people.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

MR. WARDROPE: Is not that our philosophy, that they probably stole from this great old province? Bruce Hutchison continues:

The socialist has become a pragmatist. He could not be anything else and hold office for long in a province of farmers and a nation which has repeatedly rejected socialism.

No clear label can be attached to the Saskatchewan administration and the farmer isn't interested in labels anyway. He is interested in selling his grain for the best price he can get.

He is a free enterpriser, and a capitalist, and he is not ashamed of it. Sometimes people mention capitalists and free enterprisers and think it is something terrible. It is the way this great democracy of ours and the way in which our economy was built, and the day we lose it, will be a very serious one for our people. This continues:

To this end, he has constructed a gigantic socialist experiment within a free enterprise state. The Canadian Wheat Board, an organ of the federal government and the result mainly of Saskatchewan's pressure, buys all wheat produced in Canada, sells it and divides its returns among the farmers.

I am not going to bother you with so much of this.

MR. MacDONALD: It is good.

MR. WARDROPE: Bruce Hutchison continues:

The mind of this people is coloured and distinguished not by any ideology but by that earth, by climate, and by the lonely toil of nameless men ploughing their own fields.

They were not getting together in union meetings, but they were out working their own farms, to get something for their wives and families.

Happily the provincial economy is broadening and taking on new dimensions with the discovery of new resources, is growing less dependent on a single source of wealth, and, in Mr. Douglas' opinion, will be the richest area on the prairies—richer even than booming Alberta—a few years hence.

And even then they will go back into the Conservative field.

Nevertheless, the soil and its crops will remain the basic fact of Saskatchewan. The true view of its people will be found not in the politics of Regina, in the central offices of the powerful farm organizations, or in the workers of the new industries.

It will be found in the established farmer, a capitalist with heavy investment in machinery, or, still more vividly, in the settler up north, where the plains merge with the timber of the parklands.

Despite the discouragement of the current grain market, the settler is still clearing land, planting seed, building cabins of poplar logs and saving up his money to buy his first tractor.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for York South that that is the philosophy which he should follow. Then he would be on the right track and be of real help to the people, in order to help Canada to become the greatest country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say it is always a pleasure for me to

speak in this House. I appreciate this year the debates which have been held. I think the speeches have been very well done, and very cleverly put. I feel deeply and support whole heartedly the great programme that our hon. Prime Minister is bringing to the people of this province. We heard him this afternoon talk about new water resources costing \$2½ billion. We also heard him speak about other things that have been the brain child brought to us by our hon. Prime Minister. I say personally—and I know I am speaking for the rest of the province—"Carry on, good Old Man Ontario, to help the people of this province, to make it the greatest province in the greatest Dominion in the greatest part of the world."

MR. G. W. INNES (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on the appointment to your high office in this Legislature and may I say, sir, that your clear and forceful voice fits you well for your honoured position. While I cannot congratulate the government which you represent, I may say that up to the present time the honourable Ministers of the various departments have, in most instances, been co-operative and I trust this will continue, which is the way it should be. Unlike the honourable member from South Renfrew who stated "It was another emphatic expression of confidence of the electors in the government which I have the honour to support", may I say, sir, that it was through some lack of confidence in the government that the electors of Oxford supported me.

Since it is customary for a new member in his maiden speech to praise his constituency and also since you have not had a new member from Oxford for 12 years, I thought I might bring the honourable members of the House up to date on some of the facts relating to the best county in the province of Ontario.

Oxford has as its county seat the city of Woodstock and its location is given as "situated in the heart of Canada's

dairy land". This is as it should be, for in the county of Oxford we have the greatest concentration of dairy cattle of any county in America. There are more dairy herds in this county *alone* than in some of our provinces and in some of the entire States of that great country south of us.

I do not want to create the impression that dairying is our only or main agricultural enterprise. The town of Tillsonburg boasts of being located in the centre of the tobacco belt of southern Ontario. The town of Ingersoll has long been famous for its cheese.

Cash crops and fruit farming are the source of revenue for another large group of farmers in the country as is beef, poultry and hog production.

Agricultural experts and delegations from all parts of the world have visited this county because it ranks near the top for initiative in new developments in agricultural technique.

Similar to other parts of the province, it has enjoyed a tremendous and growing concentration of industry. Since it is located in the heart of south western Ontario, its industrial expansion will continue to grow. At the present time a \$12 million cement plant is being constructed in the near centre of the county which will be a great stimulant to business and industry both for Oxford and the province.

In the county of Oxford, like so many other counties in the province, we have many tobacco and cash crop farmers who are using irrigation systems out of rivers and creeks. A great number of the residents farther down the rivers become the victims of circumstance and there is nothing in their power they can do to correct the situation. Only this past summer a petition was presented to me of over 100 names from the village of Otterville which I, in turn, forwarded to the Minister of Lands and Forests. They were requesting that some action be taken to alleviate the situation at the dam site and in the Park area, where it had completely dried up and all the fish

had died causing a most unsanitary condition. Grist mills ceased to operate down past the dam site and farmers had no water for their livestock.

This condition was the direct result of large irrigating pumps lowering the water out of the Otter Creek in a most indiscriminate manner. One farmer would start and just like a chain reaction they all started using pumps. This is a most serious situation and it will continue to get worse if some definite action is not taken in the near future. May I impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, that this is an emergency. I do not know how many more situations are similar to this one in the province, but a definite law must be set up by the province to cope with emergency conditions such as this.

Throughout the years many of our old river beds, dam sites and small ponds and lakes have become filled up with silt which is a direct result of extensive cultivation and erosion in the Spring run off. Hence the holding capacity of these bodies is in some cases less than half of what it was 50 years ago.

I would, at this point, like to congratulate the Water Resources Commission of Ontario on the excellent work they have done and are doing and I know the hon. Prime Minister spoke most favourable to this most important commission today as did some other hon. members. My regret, however, is to remark that it is most unfortunate that this commission was not formed about ten years ago, before so many communities became confronted with such a drastic water shortage.

I sincerely believe that the best insurance we can guarantee to the future generations of Ontario is to put more funds into the sinking down of dam sites and river beds and not so much in the sinking fund of the province. We must instill into the minds of the residents of Ontario more respect for the storing up of water and convince them that water is not a commodity which cannot be exhausted. There is a



real challenge to every township and municipality in this province to study the water potential of their particular community through the guidance of the Water Commission or possibly their Agriculture Representative.

During the past few months great strides have been made towards safety on our highways. However, in Oxford County at Creditville on No. 2 Highway which is, incidentally, one of the most highly travelled highways in the province, we have the most hazardous "S" crossing in the province. So much so that it has been named "Suicide Crossing". In the past five years there have been approximately 80 accidents at this crossing involving thousands of dollars of damage and severe injuries. After a great many complaints by public-minded citizens to me I contacted the Department of Highways on July 22nd, 1955. I suggested that if there was one place that required a blinker light in the province this was certainly a true example. Some checkerboard signs were put up but up to the present no light was installed and the accidents continue.

Also, in regard to this matter, I would like to read a letter tabled in the House of Commons July 22nd, 1955, which was written to The Hon. Mr. Marler, Minister of Transport, by Justice John D. Kearney, Chief Commissioner of the Board of Transport of Canada. This letter appears on page 6593 of the House of Commons Debates and is as follows:

Dear Mr. Marler:

May I refer to your letter of July 18, 1955, concerning the further accidents which have occurred at the Creditville crossing. These further accidents, I must say, at the outset, are in the same category as those earlier reported to you: that is to say, none of them have involved both a train movement and death or personal injury to a person using the crossing and were not therefore required to be reported to the board by the railway.

You may recall that when this matter was first raised, full consideration was given to it by the board, although

none of the accidents which had occurred in the vicinity were "crossing accidents" of the kind required to be reported to the board. The results of the board's inquiries and discussions were reported to you in my letter of May 2, 1955, and were, I understand, communicated by you to the railway committee.

Officials of the board have since then been in touch with the interested authorities at various levels: as recently as today it has been confirmed that the highway department has under advisement a re-alignment of the highway now crossing the railway, and a grade separation at the point of which the re-aligned highway will cross the railway. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter and plan which were sent to the board by the department of highways, following a joint inspection of the vicinity by a member of the board's engineering staff, accompanied by representatives of the railway and the highway department.

I must add that the provincial department of highways has indicated that there are inherent difficulties in arranging for a re-alignment of a highway nearly a mile in length, particularly in view of the heavy property damage which would be involved, and I am informed that the cost of the re-alignment alone might well be in the neighbourhood of \$250,000.

On the other hand, the danger situation in this area—which judging from the nature of the accidents must be largely due to the curvature of the highway together with the heavy traffic thereon—now is well known to all concerned. Certainly the board stands ready to assist in any way possible within the limits of the Railway Act. As you know, under the most recent amendment, the board may make a contribution from the grade crossing fund of 60 per cent. of the cost of such projects up to a maximum of \$300,000. The Board will continue to promote what appears to be neces-

sary action in this matter, and will moreover deal promptly with any application received in this regard.

In my own view, it is most important that this portion of Highway No. 2, which is one of the main thoroughfare between the Windsor-Detroit area and the Hamilton area, should, not only for the protection of our own citizens but in the interests of Canada's good name, be as safe as possible.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

MR. JUSTICE JOHN D. KEARNEY.

Consequently, I feel the Department of Highways should in no way hesitate to correct this situation immediately, since the Federal authorities have agreed to co-operate and since the accidents have been due to the *curvature* of the highway.

As a member of this House, I would be remiss to my constituents and to my province if I did not bring to your attention a petition I received last week-end of over 200 taxpayers and daily users of the Governor's Road requesting, as others have in the past, that this be paved by the Department of Highways. This historic road, named for Governor Simcoe, is a direct route and short cut from Woodstock and Thamesford, a distance of approximately 12 miles connecting up with No. 2 at each end. It is a highly travelled road, an industrial road and a residential road. Through the years our county has spent thousands and thousands of dollars on maintenance. As soon as they get it in good condition, the large transports en route from Windsor to Toronto and Montreal start travelling it in preference to Highway No. 2 because it is a direct route and a short cut. In a few days it is back in its original bad condition and a disgrace to our county and the province. It has been expressed time and time again in this House, quite sincerely I believe, by the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members that they are working for the interests of all

people in the province. We cannot stand in the way of progress. As I mentioned previously, a new \$12 million cement plant is being constructed in this location and it will be almost impossible for the county to maintain this gravel road to carry the thousands of tons of cement out of this plant besides its normal traffic. It is necessary to use this road and only this road to go either east or west to connecting highways. "Forward Ontario." Let's face these facts, as I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways and any member of his department cannot truthfully say this is not essential when it will mean so much to the county and to Ontario.

In the northern section of the county on Highway 97 we have two very narrow bridges where only one car can pass through at a time and one of these bridges is in a hollow. These are definite death traps and I would urge the hon. Minister of Highways to give them due consideration, since the Oxford Federation of Agriculture supported a motion 100 per cent. to widen these bridges and since the Attorney-General's department is anxious to eliminate accident traps.

In this day and age when we are building so many highways circumstances often arise where there is a piece of land separated from others and not readily accessible for practical purposes. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some of this land should be reforested by the government and not sold to some individual who will let it grow up in weeds and be no credit to the county or the province.

Speaking of highways, mention was made by the hon. Prime Minister that settlements were now made in 90 days. May I remind the hon. Prime Minister that in my particular County of Oxford there are still settlements to be made on 401 which, I understand, is to be paved this year and that the time period would be much closer to 900 days than 90 days.

While last, but by no means least, I would like to deal with agriculture. This

primary industry has been receiving more squeeze from every angle than any other commodity group in the province of Ontario in the past few years. Some of the hon. members of this House have expressed concern over the future of the industry and rightly so. When agriculture prospers so does the rest of the population.

Having been born and raised on a farm and now the owner of a farm, I do realize some of the problems we are confronted with from time to time. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has files and files of briefs and solutions for the government to implement and to correct the situation sent in by farm organizations all over the province.

I agree with my colleague, the hon. member for Bruce, that we need more people to use the surpluses. With Ontario increasing at the rate of 15,000 per month and if it continues to increase at that rate, some of our problems *may* be taken care of. But we cannot stand idly by at the present time when they alone of all major groups have seen their incomes decline rather than rise.

Agriculture must keep abreast of the times. We do not expect to drive the same car today that we did 25 years ago. We must think in terms of today and tomorrow. We must do a selling job to the consumers of our products in this province.

Farming today is looked upon as a business and if we are going to run it as such we must be good business men. Sales and Promotion are the key departments in any firm and they should be in Agriculture.

I maintain the Department of Agriculture of this province is not giving the proper leadership and guidance to farm organizations that they should be. Not only must we produce efficiently but we must sell effectively. How many soft drink and cigarette vending machines do you see in your town, in your city and in the province? Now, how many milk vending machines do

you see? Quite a comparison! How often do you open up your newspaper and see a full or double page advertisement on margarine? How often do you open up your newspaper and see a full or double page advertisement on margarine? How often do you see a full or double page advertisement on butter or cheese? I think never. Yet, do you know that if every family in Canada were to consume one-half an ounce of butter more per week, there would be no butter surplus?

Do you know that the gallonage of milk in the province in 1955 was 179,400,000 and that the gallonage of alcoholic beverages was 88,431,423? Or for every quart of milk consumed there was one pint of alcoholic beverages consumed. The dairy farmers of Canada last year appropriated \$300,000 toward advertisement, but do you know that one brewing company alone spent \$1,600,000 in advertising last year.

Any industry or business in the province will tell you they cannot exist without a top notch sales staff, and advertising department. But where is your sales staff for Agricultural Products. The public as a whole is not educated to the highly nutritional value of many of the farm products. Substitutes are creeping into the picture daily due to high pressure salesmanship—radio, T.V., newspapers, etc. We must compete and we must wake up.

I do not think we need more men in the Department of Agriculture nor do we need more competent men but we must have some action and devote less time to Production and more to Promotion, Marketing and Merchandising.

Too much of the consumer's food dollar is going to processors, distributors and retailers. The farmer takes what is left and it is an ever-decreasing share. The average consumer does not know what the farmer receives for the different commodities and the price spread. Here are some figures for the year 1954 that will really amaze you and anyone else if they were publicized more.



| <i>The Price Received by the Farmers</i>     | <i>The Consumer pays</i> | <i>Farm Prices as a per cent. of Retail Value</i> |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| For 100 lbs. of beef—\$18.95                 | \$32.67                  | 77  |
| For 100 lbs. of fluid milk—\$4.44            | 8.38                     | 58  |
| For 100 lbs. of milk for cheese—\$2.08       | 7.70                     | 53  |
| For 1 ton of canned tomatoes—\$33.36         | 139.00                   | 27  |
| For 1 ton of canned peaches—\$88.45          | 432.19                   | 24  |
| For 1 ton of canned peas—\$101.16            | \$505.80                 | 21  |
| For 1 ton of canned corn—\$25.23             | 148.41                   | 20  |
| For 1 bushel of wheat made into bread—\$1.62 | 10.80                    | 15  |

1. Source—As reported in Ontario statistics.
2. Percentages—As calculated and reported in Economic Annalist—August, 1954

Why does the public not know about these facts? Because the Public Relations are nil and they must improve immediately. This is by no means a cure-all but I will guarantee it will help. May I impress upon the hon. Prime Minister the necessity of establishing a high calibre, enthusiastic, go-getting group for public relations understanding the farmers' problems with the power to divert more of the consumer's dollar to the producer.

Only the first of this month, Mr. Speaker, one of the breed organizations of this province designated several thousand dollars to promote and sell its products. I wish to congratulate them most heartily and I hope that more will follow suit, instead of preparing briefs to put on the desk of the hon. member from Elgin.

Experts have estimated the consumption of milk per day, per person is .86 pints. From the standpoint of health, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Health would agree, a desirable minimum consumption per person, per day is *at least* one pint. If consumption were increased to the mere minimum desirable level this alone would use an additional 25.5 quarts per person per year, which would increase the consumption by almost 50 per cent.

You may question why I am stressing more fluid milk sales when they are the one group of farmers who are not suf-

fering to any great extent at the present time. I would ask you to kindly refer to "Submission of Ontario to the Royal Commission" on Canada's Economic Prospects dated January 26, 1956 on page 148—Percentage utilization of whole milk in Ontario 1940-1954. You will note "Fluid milk consumption has increased almost 10 per cent., ice-cream and processed products 6 per cent. This has *decreased* the amount of milk going into cheese and butter by approximately 16 per cent." Hence, if we can boost our fluid milk consumption, it will tend to create a *scarcity* in the butter and cheese market and consequently influence a rise in price.

In regard to the butter and cheese industry we must also do a selling job and also increase our quality. Dr. E. N. Fabricus, formerly of Iowa State College and a widely recognized butter expert stated in *Hoard's Dairyman* recently—I quote:

We are messing around with a lot of ideas to solve the dairy farmers problems—all are complicated and may or may not solve the problem. Fine flavour quality will solve the problem with no real hardship for anyone."

While I am not ordinarily in favour of subsidizing beef and pork I do feel that it is warranted at the present time. Due to the low prices of pork at present

the producers have not been producing the quality they should be, to command top prices on both the domestic and export markets. To back up the evidence it is quite well known that Canadian pork is being exported to the United States at the present time even at a higher price than American pork prices. The price differential on Grade A hogs and top quality beef is not sufficient to warrant the extra care and management on the part of the producer. I believe the percentage of Grade A hogs has dropped from 39 per cent. to less than 30 per cent. in the last 10 years. This is a bad situation because the only pork we can export to be the most beneficial to the industry in repeat and expanding orders are Grade A hogs.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the hon. Minister of Agriculture to strongly consider a premium on top quality pork and beef as I sincerely believe it will have a steadying effect on the market in this province. This would not be an incentive to over-production but will bring up the quality of our products.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that as a member of the Opposition of this House we have a real challenge in presenting the wishes of an average 50,000 electors of this province per member, while each government member is representing the wishes of an average 10,000 electors per member.

It is my ambition to be a credit to this House, to the Party I represent and to the people of my county. I hope this can be attained through constructive criticism and a practical approach to all matters pertaining to the betterment of the people of this wealthy and prosperous Ontario.

MR. R. E. SUTTON (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, may I extend to you my congratulations on your appointment to the high office which you occupy in this House. Your years of service as a member of this assembly have well qualified you as to the heavy, and sometimes difficult duties related to your office. It is gratifying to all of us, I am sure, to know that the task of

presiding over our deliberations is in such capable hands.

May I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the address presented to this House by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. It is a pleasure to welcome the hon. member for Renfrew South, Mr. Maloney, who joins our ranks, backed up with such an impressive majority at the hands of the people who know him best. Our great north country has an able advocate in the person of the hon. member from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) who presented to us in such a graphic manner a picture of the wonderful developments in Ontario's treasure house of land, forest, and mine.

There is a tendency today to deplore the passing of the pioneer spirit, a tendency which will not stand up under the acid test, I suggest, after listening to that address delivered by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons). It is my honour and my privilege to represent the riding of York-Scarborough, and I can assure you that the pioneer spirit is by no means lacking among my constituents, expressed though it may be in ways differing from the usual connotation.

The term "township" suggests a strictly rural area, and indeed a large part of Scarborough is still an agricultural community. We are, however, also an urban community of no small stature.

Scarborough township embraces an area of 70.4 square miles. The population as of two years ago was placed at 96,000, but our growth is so rapid that our municipal statistics are very quickly out of date. The present population is not less than 120,000, and indeed some fairly reliable estimates place it very considerably higher, at 140,000. Assessment on real estate today is approximately \$203 million, to which must be added business assessment of \$16 million. This has grown from \$174 million since the Metropolitan Area came into being. Without attempting to quote detailed statistics, it will be seen readily enough that Scarborough's municipal

problems compare in a general way with the problems of such centres of population as, for example, the cities of Windsor or London.

Incorporated in 1850, Scarborough tended to retain its rural characteristics until fairly recent years when it became subject to changes consistent with a fairly well-defined pattern. In a word, big centres of population always tend to become still bigger. We have an outstanding example in the case of Toronto. Our capital city has for many years been enjoying a period of very great expansion. The process was hastened during World War II which saw a vast expansion of Toronto's industry and which inevitably brought to the city many thousands of new residents. Many, if not most of them, have remained in their new surroundings, and again inevitably, have overflowed into the Toronto suburban areas.

Again, Toronto is cramped for living room as we all so well know. Naturally enough, there began the great migration to the suburbs. Scarborough and its then wide-open spaces, became the promised land for those seeking new homes, and also for those seeking escape from the crowded conditions affecting a great, modern city. This great influx of population has created a multitude of new challenges and problems, individual, provincial, and municipal.

The first settler of record in Scarborough was David Thomson who built himself a log cabin at Bendale in the year 1795, indeed a long time ago. He left his home in Westkirk, Scotland, in a time of great agricultural depression in the old land. Major war was threatening. Business proceeded at an uncertain pace. Employment opportunities were few and far between, and the spectre of famine stalked in the land. No wonder that David Thomson and thousands of his fellows balanced pioneer hardships against the rude comfort and promised abundance of a new and almost unknown land.

Bendale, where David Thomson settled, is but a stone's throw from the site where the new Scarborough Gen-

eral Hospital is being brought into being. And let us not forget that the early labours of David Thomson and others with his foresight and courage laid the foundations for what we have today.

In the light of readily available information it is not difficult to foresee Scarborough's future so that there is no reason why there should not be adequate planning for the future on both the provincial and municipal levels.

Toronto has an area of 34.9 square miles, and has left very little land for either industrial or residential construction. Here, as to building construction for the future, redevelopment is obviously the chief factor.

North York Township has an area of 69.7 square miles; Etobicoke 42.7 square miles; East York 5.9 square miles, and York Township 7.9 square miles. As I have mentioned Scarborough has an area of 70.4 square miles. The remainder of the 13 municipalities constituting the Metropolitan Area are very small as to area, varying from Mimico and Long Branch with less than one square mile to Leaside with just under two square miles.

Populations also vary widely; Scarborough, as I mentioned, has a population upwards of 120,000; North York probably 140,000; York Township and Etobicoke, well over 100,000. The remaining suburban municipalities have relatively small populations, this just as a matter of fact and by no means an attempt to disparage their importance in the local scene.

In passing, I should point out that the present legislation applicable to the Metropolitan Area ignores, and indeed, violates the principle of representation by population. Federally, provincially, and municipally, this principle is by no means applied 100 per cent., nor can it be because of geographical and other perfectly sound reasons. The formation of the metropolitan area was a vast and courageous experiment. The main thing is that it is working, and working well. It reflects the greatest credit on the vision, the skill, the courage and the



sound common sense of its authors. It is, of course inevitable, that amendments will be needed, and I suggest that consideration be given to the necessity and the desirability of imposing a more realistic view in giving representation on the Metro Council on something approaching a proper analysis of population factors. I do not suggest for a moment that we should upset the basic setup, but I should not be fair to my constituents if I argued that the 120,000 people of Scarborough should have the same representation as a municipality with a population of one-tenth its size.

We have in Scarborough today between 500 and 600 industries employing about 40,000 people. The employees do not all live in the township; probably not more than 10 per cent. are local residents. The majority of our people are farmers, merchants, men operating various kinds of businesses, and finally folks who live in the township but who are employed in other parts of the Metro Area.

When I said that the pioneer spirit is not dead, I had our own people in mind. They have flocked into Scarborough by the thousands. Hundreds if not thousands have built their own homes with their own hands. They have, many of them, put up with all sorts of inconveniences if not hardships while getting their homes established. They have waited for essential services. They have fought their way through mud and snow over indifferent roads. They endure winter's snow and summer's heat waiting on corners for inadequate bus services. But they are getting their homes together, and most of them are doing the job through their own efforts.

Then we have another type of pioneer, the manufacturers and the merchants who are flocking within our borders. Some of Canada's finest manufacturing plants are located in Scarborough Township. A list of them would look like a manufacturers' directory. The names of many of them are household words. Just now, for example, the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Company, Ltd., is launching a \$250,000 land purchase for a branch enterprise. The Johns-Manville

Company, Ltd., the Frigidaire Corporation, Rootes Motors, the SKF Canadian Company Ltd., Link-Belt, The John Inglis Co., Ltd., all these and hundreds of others are operating in our midst. Their products go all over the world. They are filling thousands of pay envelopes. As the early pioneers risked the whims and hazards of nature, so these manufacturers and merchants risk the earnings, the savings of the investors in building a great new community in a great and relatively new country.

Scarborough—Scarborough's Golden Mile—are evidence of the work not of one man but of many. We have heard some flamboyant claims as to who is responsible for Scarborough's remarkable and onrushing development. I scarcely need say that our development results from our favourable location, an adequate power supply, good railway and highway facilities, and more than all the courage, the industry, the thrift and the vision of our people. We have a great future out in Scarborough Township and with the completion of The Great St. Lawrence Seaway, we shall have a still greater one.

It is a simple matter to state the extent of some of our problems; they are problems which are faced by every growing municipality in Ontario. Since 1951, we have had to build 21 new schools with 175 classrooms, 11 kindergartens and 10 playrooms. Additions have been made to 33 schools. They involve 113 classrooms, 1 kindergarten, and 5 playrooms. The cost works out at just about \$7.5 million. This relates to elementary schools only.

Four new separate schools have been built with 39 classrooms and two rooms have been added to existing schools, this at a cost of \$887,000. Altogether we have added 329 classrooms, 12 kindergartens and 15 playrooms at a total cost of \$8,316,219.

In the past 5 years provision has been made in Scarborough for the addition of space in high schools and collegiate institutes for 3,420 pupils. The estimated cost is placed at \$5,080,000, and the estimated approved expenditure, that is, approved by the Department of

Education is \$3,045,000. We all know that our education costs are burdensome. They are too burdensome to the homeowner.

One reason lies in the fact that our assessment is out of balance. It is about 28 per cent. industrial as against 72 per cent. residential. An ideal ratio is 50-50, and a satisfactory ratio is probably 40 per cent. industrial and commercial and 60 per cent. residential.

I would like to make this suggestion. Education is an over-all service. It should be based on the broadest possible tax structure. I suggest, therefore, that in amending the Metro Area legislation, consideration should be given to making education costs entirely a Metropolitan obligation. Metro was a daring, but a well-planned and highly successful experiment. There is bound to be more and more elimination of duplication as our people realize that we are much better off by reasonable consolidation.

Transportation remains a difficult and perplexing problem. The Kingston Road is overcrowded. It is now a Metro street from Highland Creek to the City Limits. It is subject to innumerable encroachments. Frankly, it is not an adequate, modern express-way into the heart of a great city.

The Interceptor Road, the Toronto-Bypass as it is called, will be paved throughout and be open for traffic by midsummer this year. It may not be a final solution to traffic problems in the territory it traverses but it will help.

The Lansing Cutoff, running through Agincourt is an old and useful highway, but on many occasions, hopelessly overloaded. If rebuilt as a dual-lane highway, its usefulness would be greatly increased.

Eglinton avenue east, paved some 7 or 8 years ago as a Provincial highway, has been assumed by the Metro authority. In the grading and paving operations of a few years ago, the engineers of The Ontario Department of Highways were fore-sighted in making provisions for the paving of two additional traffic lanes. This necessary work has been completed in large part by the

Metro authority. I understand the work will be completed this year. It is most unfortunate that progress has been impeded by the red tape involved in getting the widened pavement across two railway lines belonging to the Canadian National Railways.

Satisfactory progress is being made on construction of a very large bridge to connect Eglinton West with Eglinton East, thus giving another great cross-town thoroughfare to the whole Metro Area. The provincial contribution of 80 per cent. of the cost of this structure will be no small item.

I should commend to the attention of the administration and of the hon. The Minister of Highways in particular, the whole question of level crossing elimination. On Eglinton Avenue East there is a crossing adjacent to the Kitchener school. The line is a single track, not too busy a one, protected by a flasher. Near Scarborough Village the main line of the CNR crosses Eglinton Avenue East. Here, there is a wig-wag, but the traffic is heavy; there have been accidents involving tragic loss of life. Grade separation here is a matter of urgency.

In Agincourt there are two level crossings, one of them on an important CPR line. On occasion the traffic on the Lansing Cutoff is blocked off and piled up for miles while trains are passing, or more likely, standing on a siding. There are many other level crossings throughout the township. I have mentioned only a few. But the problem of getting rid of them is an urgent one and it can be easier resolved now rather than later on when greater property damage will likely ensue.

In dealing with level crossing elimination a co-operative effort is a necessity. The municipalities, The Department of Highways, The Board of Transport Commissioners, the railways and also the Federal Government—they all have their responsibilities. The whole Metropolitan Area is studded with this particular menace to life and limb, to say nothing of property damage. I sincerely urge the administration to tackle this problem with vigour and despatch.

Out in Scarborough we have recently had some dealings with the Canadian National, and we have resolved what promised to become a most trying problem. The long-range plans of the CNR involved installation of a marshaling yard. This meant the installation of some 40 tracks, about 2 miles in length. It also meant a huge depreciation in residential properties adjacent to the site. Our negotiations in which I had a part have had some important results. The railway will now proceed with the installation of only 12 or 13 tracks as required for car storage by local industry. Property adjoining the main line of the CNR is to be used for (a) an 86 ft. wide service road, (b) industrial sites. This industrial property is  $1\frac{3}{4}$  miles long by 450 feet in depth and will accommodate many new industries. As industry is established it will find itself well-located as to transportation. Our assessment will, we hope, commence to get into balance, and our nationally-owned railway will benefit from an important traffic increase.

While on the subject of railways, may I commend the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Frost) for his earnest and continuing campaign for commuter services. Both north and east of the City of Toronto are areas which could be served well by our railways if commuter services were available. Such services would operate to advantage as to very many communities, Agincourt, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, Pickering, Whitby, Oshawa and Port Hope, to mention only a few. I shall not enlarge on the subject which has been covered so well by my colleague from Bracondale. But I do suggest this. Within a very few years we shall probably have two automobiles on the street as against one today, and barring a terrific and costly expansion of our street and highway systems, traffic is simply going to grind to a standstill. I believe that we have the engineering know-how and the planning ability to get the railways into the business of mass transportation of our workers. I believe this can be done with tremendous savings as to street and highway improvements. And if the railways will

put aside their long-standing prejudice against passenger traffic, I believe they can develop an immense field of profitable business. As was suggested by the hon. member for Bracondale, perhaps the authority of the select committee on toll roads might well be enlarged to permit them to look into the question of commuter business.

We have heard something of the enormous Hydro developments which have occurred with the backing of this administration. A previous government adopted an attitude of complete and utter defeatism as to Hydro's future. In other words, they had no vision, no confidence, no faith in Ontario's future. Any one of Hydro's new plants would be an enduring monument to any government. It was faith, enterprise, vision and courage, among many and diverse factors, which brought into being such great developments as La Cave, Des Joachims (Desswisham), Stewartville, Aguasabon, Chenaux, the enormous Niagara Revisions, and finally, The St. Lawrence Development. It took more than money to build the huge steam plants at Toronto and Windsor. It took more than money to launch the change-over from 25-cycle to 60-cycle power.

While the St. Lawrence Development will give this province an additional 1,100,000 horse-power, there will be beyond doubt be a market for this addition to Hydro's output almost as soon as the project is completed. As has been reiterated, we then shall have to look forward either to additional steam developments, or to atomic power. The pilot plant launched as a co-operative enterprise shared by The Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd., The Canadian General Electric Company, Limited, and by Ontario Hydro will presently produce 26,600 horse-power, to be fed into the Ontario system. It may well point the way toward the solution of our future power problems. The principle is relatively simple. An atomic reactor turns water into steam. The steam drives a conventional turbine which, in turn, drives a conventional generator. Pioneer projects of this type are not necessarily an economic success. Neither was the



first steam engine nor the first airplane. But they do represent pioneer engineering, and this particular project may well lead to permanent solution of our power problems. Happily, we have an abundant supply of uranium at Blind River and elsewhere, and this is an important and basic consideration.

I do not propose to attempt to discuss the question of health insurance in any detail. As to the principle, there is little diversity of opinion. But I do not propose to let go unchallenged a statement made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in a recent radio address. He said, "Ontario, therefore holds the key in a very realistic way to unlock the door that has barred the way to hospital insurance in Canada for many, many years."

The hon. the leader of the Opposition well knows the size of the Ontario Budget. Ordinary revenues for the 1955 fiscal year were almost exactly \$400 million. We have a very moderate tax structure, probably just about the lowest per capita tax rate in Canada. To finance an initial hospital insurance scheme will cost at \$140 million a year, rising over a relatively short period to at least \$165 million. These are large sums. The collection and expenditure are items not to be treated lightly.

More than this, the scheme must be a co-operative plan, one worked out on a national basis. The holder of the key to open the door to a reasonably satisfactory health plan, I suggest is in the hands of the government which collects 50 per cent. of its \$4½ to \$5 billion revenues from the people of Ontario. The key is in the hands of the government which collects and spends about 80 cents out of every Canadian tax dollar and which leaves the provinces and the municipalities to struggle along on the remaining 20 cents.

Ontario's government, Says the hon. leader of the Opposition proceeds to, and I quote his own words, "tarry and hesitate at the gate of opportunity."

May I remind him, Mr. Speaker, it was the head of this provincial administration who insisted on the inclusion

of the subject of hospital insurance in the agenda of the Federal-Provincial Conference in October last. It was the head of this government who urged and fought for a scheme of hospital insurance on a national basis as it must and will be.

I am sure we are all glad to note that the Federal Government has proposed a new Federal-Provincial Fiscal Conference. I have supreme confidence in the ability of the hon. Prime Minister not only to protect the interests of this province, but also to deal with the important issues at stake as a great Canadian, mindful of the welfare of our whole nation. His victory on June 9th last, was perhaps the most decisive in the history of Canadian politics. And it was a well-deserved victory. The record speaks for itself.

This year it is planned to carry on the greatest programme ever launched in the field of highway construction and betterment.

Every effort is being made to see that every boy and girl in Ontario is provided with facilities to gain a sound education.

The Ryerson Institute is to be established in new and suitable surroundings, and the Lakehead Institute will make a rich contribution to the welfare of northern Ontario.

Proposals as to the construction of new colleges are meeting with a favourable public reception.

The Departments of Health and Public Works are providing new establishments for the care of those suffering from mental disabilities. I need only mention the huge new hospital and school at Smith's Falls, the new mental hospitals at Port Arthur and North Bay, and the important extensions, built, building or projected at Hamilton, Brockville, Toronto and Kingston.

The programme related to the use of Salk vaccine as a preventative of polio is a co-operative effort of the greatest importance.

The ruinous export programme of the former government as related to

forest products has been replaced with a programme of home manufacture, resulting in employment for thousands of Ontario workmen, and in the construction of new towns as Terrace Bay and Marathon.

This administration has legislated to abolish racial discrimination.

It has enacted The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, with special provision for those who move from one job to another.

It has legislated as to equal pay for women, an example latterly followed by the Federal Government.

It has legislated to provide that women may serve on juries. It has reduced administration of justice costs by legislating for 6-man juries in certain cases.

We have seen unexampled progress in assuring our people cheap, dependable and abundant supplies of electric energy. It has guaranteed eastern Ontario an abundant future through power and waterways developments so that presently that fine part of our province will truly become the "golden triangle".

One-third of our revenues are passed along to our municipalities through grants-in-aid.

New hospitals have been built and others expanded. Capital grants have aided this programme, and these have been accompanied by rehabilitation grants and by a ten-fold increase in maintenance grants.

Municipal homes for the aged are vastly improved because the province has assumed one-half of all capital and maintenance costs.

Disabled persons allowances, pioneered by this government, are making life easier for very many unfortunate citizens.

Urban as well as rural municipalities now benefit from grants related to road and street improvements, with results that are apparent all over Ontario.

Our mining industry, backed up by sound laws and constructive administration, yearly takes on added importance,

as witness progress at Antikokan, Bancroft, Blind River and Manitouwadge.

A forthright attack is getting results in the field of highway traffic safety.

In our money markets the credit of this province stands very high.

We enjoy sound and constructive provincial leadership. Never before, I suggest have the people of this great province given more freely of their respect and real affection, than they are giving today to the head of this government. It is an honour and a privilege to give my humble support to a government headed by one of Canada's finest citizens. Long may he be spared to give leadership and direction to our affairs.

MR. H. J. PRICE (St. David) : Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the hon. members greetings from St. David Riding.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other hon. members in expressing my congratulations on your appointment. The House has made a wise choice, we have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that you will maintain the high reputation of your predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, may I also congratulate the hon. members from Renfrew South and Sault Ste. Marie for the very excellent manner in which they moved and seconded the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to occupy a seat in this Assembly and not be conscious of the responsibilities which fall on the members of the Legislature. I will at all times endeavour to serve my constituents to the best of my ability.

I am fortunate and very privileged, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity of serving in this Parliament under the distinguished leadership of a man with the able qualities of our hon. Prime Minister. I greatly appreciate the assistance given me by the hon. ministers of this government at all times in matters and problems relating to my constituents.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, in considering a member's first responsibilities to the Public Welfare, we must make every effort to find a solution to the so-called social evils. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, the survival of our type of government will depend on whether or not we succeed or fail in solving the problems confronting our people.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that two great enemies of our democratic system are civic ignorance and public apathy. It is our responsibility to place the facts of each issue honestly before the people, so that they may gain a proper understanding of them.

As most of the hon. members know, the previous member for St. David riding was Mr. E. L. Weaver. During the time he was a member of this House he contributed much to the deliberations of this Assembly. I appreciate the many kindnesses he has extended to me. I know that he will continue to take an active interest in the affairs of the riding which he represented and also in the affairs of this province.

Feeling as I do, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to the civil service of this province. They are doing an excellent job under what sometimes must seem to them to be very trying circumstances.

Earlier in this debate I noticed that the hon. Prime Minister referred to the excellent work of the Press. I would like to associate myself with those remarks and remind the House that not only are the Press the Fourth Estate as pointed out on one occasion by Edmund Burke, but the freedom of the Press is an integral part of our way of life.

Part of my riding is occupied by an area which has, over the years, achieved great prominence in the affairs of the City of Toronto.

It lies, Mr. Speaker, between Gerrard and Queen Streets, from Parliament to the Don River, and the name stems from the fact that before the turn of the century everyone in this area had a back

garden which seemed to be eminently suited for the growing of cabbage.

The area was originally settled by people from Scotland and Ulster, who either attended Lord Dufferin School on Berkeley Street or Park School on Sydenham Street. I would remind the House that this area has produced such mayors of Toronto as Tommy Church, Jim Simpson and Bert Wemp. R. J. Fleming, a former Speaker of this Assembly, and Major Alex Lewis were both products of cabbagetown. Whether this was due in part to the inclusion of cabbage in the daily diet may be a debatable point, but it is worth considering in view of the many celebrated and prominent Canadians who have come from this area and whose names time does not permit me to mention.

In the past two years, there have been many important developments in my riding. Not the least of these are the acquisition of a new library, a new fire hall and a new police station, which, I may say, Mr. Speaker, are the last word in every respect.

The real resources of this province, Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times, are not our mines, our timber or our agriculture, but our people.

I find that a great many of the people living in my riding do not have much opportunity of getting away from the city during the hot summer months. In a province such as ours, with our great rivers and lakes in the north, it seems hard to understand why more park areas could not be set aside and made available to people who do not have a great deal of money to spend on recreation. I would encourage the government to give consideration to this. If we had areas such as I have in mind, it would make possible a holiday for a great many people who are at the present time unable to afford such a holiday.

I would like to make a few remarks now, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of education.

Education is the vanguard of democracy.

One of the greatest needs of education for our boys and girls today in this



province is education in citizenship. They must understand the system of government under which they live. Then, and then only, Mr. Speaker, will they be able to place a true value on its worth.

At one end of the rainbow of education we have the brilliant students. At the other end we have those who, through no fault of their own, are incapable of absorbing more than a modicum of learning. Both extremes, Mr. Speaker, are deserving of our sincere interest. We must assist both groups to the best of our ability financially. The gateway to education should not be barred because of lack of dollars. Adequate grants must be given for the education of our brilliant students as well as the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have noticed a healthy trend in the past year or so towards more demand for technical education. It seems to me this is a trend we should encourage, particularly through our technical schools.

It is my feeling that a considerable number of the members of this House approve of the approach made by the hon. Prime Minister and the other hon. Ministers of this government in connection with hospital insurance.

The people of Ontario both want and need hospital insurance, but, when we give them a plan, let us give them a good one.

More than half the people in Ontario are covered today by some form of health insurance. What the people of Ontario need, Mr. Speaker, is a comprehensive basic plan without "gimmicks"; without trick clauses, without a waiting period and without deductibles. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a plan that goes all the way.

If we implement the kind of a plan I believe the people deserve, it will be one of the greatest forward steps we have taken for the people of this province in our long history.

The health of our people, Mr. Speaker, is important business. Surely everyone should have access to hospital care, irrespective of their financial cir-

cumstances. It is not a dole but something the people are entitled to get.

Let us have in this province, Mr. Speaker, the kind of a plan that will set a standard for others to follow; a prepaid plan which is owned by the people.

Since one of the largest of the so called public housing developments is located in my riding I wish to say a few words on this subject. It is some nine years ago since Regent Park north was commenced. The project occupies the northern half of "cabbage town" covering an area of a little better than forty-two acres. When this part of the project is completed this year it is expected there will be some 6,000 people living in these apartments, of whom more than 2,000 will be children under 16 years of age. The net cost of this whole project is estimated at \$11,640,000 of which the provincial contribution will amount to \$1,362,000 which I might remind hon. members was an outright grant.

Prior to the building of Regent Park north, the area netted the city \$36,100 a year in taxes. By the time the project is completed the area will earn in taxes for the City of Toronto some \$240,000 each year.

I do not advocate the government getting into housing, but I do encourage this government to give every assistance to private enterprise in the establishment of genuine low rental housing. In the Toronto area alone there are at least 8,000 applicants for this type of accommodation.

There is another subject I would like to mention, I think the most important part of my speech, and that is old age pensions. This matter is of extreme importance to many of my constituents who are living at such places as Seaton House, Kingsley Hall and the House of Providence. All of these homes are doing an excellent job in looking after the interests of older citizens, who no longer have a home of their own.

But I join with the other hon. members of this house in urging this government to seek an agreement with

Ottawa and increase the present pension by at least \$25 a month. It is absolutely impossible for these people to exist in these inflationary times on the present \$40 a month. It is a serious and continuing reflection upon government. I know it is something the hon. Prime Minister has very much in mind and I hope it will soon be possible to do something about this.

We stand on the threshold of a tremendous era of development of this old Province of Ontario. The magnitude of the concepts for water supply, sewage disposal, Hydro development and other essential services now in the blueprint stage augurs well for a prosperous future. The coming of the St. Lawrence Seaway will do much to help us forward by linking the products of our farms and factories with the markets of the world.

It is no small privilege and no small responsibility that rests on the shoulders of this government today. I am very humble but very proud to be a member of it.

Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, I thank you for the hearing you have given me.

MR. JOHN ROOT (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to enter this debate at this late hour, but we have listened to many interesting speeches by hon. members from northern Ontario, the urban centres, and various parts of the province, and, as my riding is one of the fine rural ridings of the province, I thought I could not let this debate close without saying something regarding rural Ontario.

However, first I would like to pay my tribute to you, Mr. Speaker. The people of Wellington-Dufferin have followed Mr. Speaker's career with great interest. He entered the field of public service in 1929, in the old riding of Wellington North. That was some 27 years ago, and during that time he has given faithful service to this province, to his own riding, and to his country. Had he entered many other vocations, after 27 years of service, he would no

doubt have earned for himself a very generous pension.

When the election was over on June 9, and the smoke of battle had cleared away, I took a look around to see who my neighbours were, and I found that I had acquired 3 new neighbours. I wondered just how that would affect me in this 25th Legislature, but when I realized that I had Mr. Speaker to the east of me, and to the west my neighbour was the chairman of the committee of the whole House, I felt a little easier. May I be allowed to congratulate the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) on the high position which he now holds, and for which his long years of service have fitted him well.

I wondered about my 3 new neighbours, but having heard them speak in the House, and listening carefully to them, and having the privilege of meeting them, I am quite convinced their election was no vote for or against the government, but rather a personal tribute to 3 very fine gentlemen.

May I now commend the mover and seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am not going to refer to their speeches in detail, but I would say that the high quality of their addresses—particularly that of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) whose command of the English language and his powers of oratory are greatly admired, as was the way he painted his word pictures. I am sure their speeches made a great contribution to the business of this House, and make people who sit in the galleries proud of their Legislature.

I have another neighbour to the north, Mr. Speaker, for whom I have a great deal of respect. I refer to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). I could not help but like him as, after all, he is a product of the farm. If you listen to his strong voice, it is evident that he developed it on the farm, perhaps calling the cows in the mornings, before breakfast.

However, he did say something in his first speech which caused me a little

surprise. Speaking in the debate, he made mention of the speech of the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney). Apparently a road was discussed during the by-election in that district, and the point was raised as to whether or not the government should talk about roads during an election. The hon. leader of the Opposition went on to say—and this is the part to what I objected, as reported in *Hansard*:

Of course, if I wanted to be more seasoned in my remarks on this particular question, I can remember that in the Quebec Legislature, just a few short weeks ago, the hon. Prime Minister of that province, as reported in the Press, replied thus to a Liberal member who wanted a bridge across the river, the name of which at the moment escapes me, although I have not forgotten the retort of the hon. Prime Minister of Quebec, who said:

“As long as this riding continues to elect a Liberal member, you will not get a bridge.” You can swim it, jump it, or stay on your own side, as long as you continue to elect a Liberal member, you will not get your bridge across the Shawinigan River.

I just want to say in passing that we do not do things like that in such a brutal way. This government does precisely the same thing but with greater finesse. They are much more subtle in the aiming of their political propaganda.

That which surprised me, in listening to that statement, was the fact that I think the hon. member for Grey South knows that one of the candidates, who had been an hon. member of this House during the election last June, openly bragged about how much work this government had done in his riding.

I will allow 3 guesses as to who that candidate was, and I think it will be guessed right the first time. It was the hon. member for Grey South. I had heard of this advertising following the election but I had not paid any par-

ticular attention to it. I thought it was a typical election programme—many promises made, a great deal of bait being held out, etc., but after this statement in the House I went back and looked it up.

Just to give an idea of what it is, I will read it. This was published in the *Dundalk Herald* on Thursday, June 2, the last edition to be circulated before the election. I will say that is good political timing, not to give the opposition time to reply. This was the advertisement:

#### OLIVER'S POLICY ON HIGHWAYS

*Priceville, Ontario*  
*May 28, 1955.*

#### TO THE ELECTORS OF GREY SOUTH:

Let us get the facts straight in respect to provincial and county roads in my riding. During my time as your member, whether in Opposition or in the government, I have constantly striven to have provincial highways improved and extended.

In Grey South I have worked for and succeeded in having the following roads improved:

Original paving of No. 6 and No. 10 Highways. On No. 10, a portion has been already repaired and contracts are let to repair the remainder from Berkeley to Flesherton. Bids will very soon be let for the paving of that part of No. 10 from Flesherton to Dundalk. Repaving of No. 6 will reach Mount Forest this year and I expect that it will be continued northward next year.

On No. 4 Highway, the Hanover to Durham section was rebuilt and paved. In the past year a 4½ mile stretch westward from Flesherton was rebuilt and prepared for paving. Some of this work was done while I was in the Liberal Government, but much while I was in the Opposition.

I have constantly criticized the Tory administration for abandoning the former Liberal policy of each year taking into the provincial highways system a certain mileage of county roads. All counties in our province



find as a result of Tory policy that they are burdened with county roads which should long ago have been made provincial highways.

If I form a Liberal Government after the election on June 9, I pledge my government to immediately assume 10 per cent of the county road mileage in Ontario—about 800 miles.

In Grey County, No. 4 Highway will be extended from Flesherton to Singhampton. The road from Shelburne to Mount Forest will be made a provincial highway; this will benefit Grey and Wellington Counties.

The road from Clifford to Allenford will be made a provincial highway, this will benefit Grey and Bruce Counties.

Sincerely,

(signed) FARQUHAR OLIVER

MR. OLIVER: I thought that was a pretty good "ad."

MR. ROOT: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the "ad.", but I thought it was not the type of "ad." an hon. member might make who was leader of the Opposition Party. I suppose he could make all those promises, but what I object to, after an "ad." of that sort helped him in winning the election, was his suggestion that this government would not build a road in the riding of a Liberal member.

Another point to which I objected was that the government should not talk about roads during election or by-election campaigns, when the hon. leader of the Opposition himself referred to the paving of No. 6 Highway north of Mount Forest, the paving of No. 10 in Dundalk and of No. 4. Then to make sure of his election he said: "We will build a new highway from Flesherton to Singhampton."

I cannot say exactly how many miles that would comprise, but I would say about 15 miles. I think most of the government candidates would have liked to have had the promise of 15 miles of highways. However, just to make sure, he should have had two highways in his

riding, another from Clifford to Allenford, which would benefit both the counties of Grey and Bruce. Using a ruler on that highway I would say it is about 50 miles long and I would suggest to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher): "Do not take yourself too seriously. The people may have voted for the highway instead of the hon. member."

MR. OLIVER: What difference does that make as long as we remind them?

MR. ROOT: To complete the picture, another highway was promised from Shelburne to Mount Forest, which is between the ridings of the hon. member and myself.

MR. OLIVER: Is that fixed up?

MR. ROOT: That was supposed to win Wellington-Dufferin, but that one did not work. You cannot "fool all the people all the time."

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member ought to know.

MR. ROOT: What I am trying to bring out is that if you take the 3 roads and tie them together, you will find it adds up to about 90 or 100 miles of highway to affect one riding directly, and two others indirectly.

A little further along in his speech something was said about "more ways of killing a cat than choking it with butter." If one riding received 100 miles of highways out of 800 for the province, that was at least the "cream." Perhaps the reason some of the other candidates were not elected was because they had to take the skim milk while the hon. member took all the butter and cream.

I just say that in passing and I would also suggest in all fairness the hon. member should ask to have that reference to the government stricken from the record, to the effect that it would not build a road in the riding of a Liberal member.

MR. OLIVER: I think I should say to the hon. member I certainly did not say I felt this government would not build the road in a riding represented by a Liberal member.

The hon. member has the provinces mixed up, that is the trouble. I may be guilty of many things, but I say to the hon. members of this House I have never felt, in the last number of years at least, that the government was particularly guilty of discriminating as between ridings represented by Liberal and Conservative members.

MR. ROOT: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member for Grey South has cleared up this fog which was left after his speech, because in his address he said the hon. Prime Minister of Quebec said, "As long as this riding continues to elect a Liberal member, you will not get a bridge."

You can swim it, jump it or stay on your own side. So long as you continue to elect the Liberal member, you will not get your bridge across the Shawinigan River.

Then the hon. member went on to say:

I just want to say in passing that we do not do things like that in such a brutal way. This government does precisely the same thing, but with greater finesse.

I am certainly pleased the hon. member cleared up the matter tonight because I would hate to think that an hon. member with a rural background would forget what he said 6 months before.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member has me all mixed up.

MR. ROOT: I had intended to say something regarding the address of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), but I am one who was brought up to believe in the principle which King Solomon laid down that you should not "spare the rod and spoil the child." I think that rule has been pretty effective up to date, and I am not going to use it any more tonight other than to say—

MR. MACDONALD: I thought the hon. member was speaking about reform institutions for a moment.

MR. ROOT: I would hate to pit my judgment against the judgment of King Solomon. If the hon. member wants to do it that is his business.

But something was said on several occasions about this government not being elected with a majority. But I think if my Party were in the position of the CCF Party, I would not want to draw anybody's attention to election comparisons, because the Progressive-Conservative Party was elected on June 9 with a clear majority in 49 ridings over all opposition, and of the members of this House, the Liberal Party elected 5 with a clear majority, the CCF elected none. The Progressive-Conservative Party had a clear majority over the combined Opposition. Now I do not know whether 50 per cent. of the people of York South, or 40 per cent., or what percentage voted, but I do know that in my own riding—which is a rural riding—77.2 per cent. of the people voted.

MR. OLIVER: Very good.

MR. ROOT: Rural people are good citizens and take their responsibilities seriously. They get out and vote. I am not taking full credit for that. I do say to the hon. member for York South, the CCF candidate in my riding did his best, but you cannot sell your policies to the rural people. I would say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker—particularly to the hon. leader of the Opposition—that the Liberal candidate was perhaps one of the best candidates who ever ran in my riding. He worked very hard and did a good job, and did not "let the Party down" at all. It is just that he could not beat a good government.

MR. OLIVER: We will have another good try at it.

MR. ROOT: I want to refer now to some of the problems and ambitions of my own riding, which is, as you know, one of the finest rural ridings in the province. I do not blame the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) for saying that Oxford is a great riding, it probably is. But I happen to represent

two-thirds of two counties, and when you get two counties like Wellington and Dufferin, you really "have something".

One of the problems confronting agriculture today is that of providing educational facilities for all our children. Ours is a rural riding, but we are starting to feel the impact of the great industrial expansion taking place all over Ontario. We find, since we started the winter plowing of roads, that literally hundreds of people are moving into the small villages and towns, and townships, and are building homes. They are good people; their children become of school age, and we have to provide school facilities. This creates a problem, because under our present system of taxation we find, for one thing, that the man who is driving to another municipality to work contributes to schools and municipal taxes only where he resides, by way of the assessment on his dwelling. But the farmer pays not only a tax on his dwelling house, but also on his barns and land. The small business man pays a tax on his dwelling house, and on his business establishment. This creates a problem.

The labouring man is paying his share of taxes in the national economy, but his taxes in the form of income tax go to the Federal Government, and I feel we will never correct the situation until more of the tax is returned to the provinces and from the provinces to the municipalities.

The rural people appreciate the very generous grants which this government has given to them, helping in a measure to correct this situation. The recent special grant payable on the basis of \$6 per pupil is just another indication of the awareness this government has of the problems which are confronting rural Ontario.

I would like to say something about classes for retarded children while I am on the subject of education. I think they are doing a very fine job, not only for the children but for the parents.

We have classes in Guelph and Orangeville.

I have visited the class in Guelph, and I find they are confronted with a very serious problem with reference to the children who come in from the rural areas. I found that children are being driven in as far as 30 miles, and this creates terrific transportation problems. I am wondering whether it would not be possible for the government to increase their grant or to do something to assist with this cost of transportation, because after all there are not too many children in this group.

Another matter I wish to bring to your attention is the fact that the grant is based on a per pupil attendance, which, in turn, creates a problem in rural Ontario. We all know that sometimes we have storms—we had one over the last week-end—and at times road conditions make it impossible to get these rural school children to the schools, with the result that the grant is cut off for the days they are absent. However, the cost of schools continue.

I am bringing it to the attention of the House in the hope that the government will give it some consideration, and perhaps do something to correct the situation.

I want now to say something in reference to welfare. I have heard a number of speakers in this debate mention the fact that people on pensions are finding it very difficult to live within the limits of their pensions. At the same time, we know that in Canada we have great surpluses of food, and our Federal Government has recently exported quite a quantity of butter at a greatly reduced price.

I believe they are even financing the shipments, and I am wondering if perhaps something could not be worked out on a coupon basis, whereby some of this cheap food could be given to people living on pensions such as the aged, the disabled, and even people drawing mother's allowances or maybe living in government institutions. In other words, the taxpayers' dollar will be benefitting our own people who need



some help, and after that, if there is anything left over, it could be shipped out to other countries which perhaps need assistance.

There is another suggestion I would like to make, and I hope it will receive some consideration. I know these things do not happen overnight, but perhaps it will have to be worked out in co-operation with the Federal Government.

I found, going around my riding, that there are a number of widows who are in great need. Perhaps their husbands died when their families were young, and they had to make a decision as to whether they would put the family in an institution or try to hold the family together. They made the decision that they would hold the family together.

Then, perhaps later on in life, when in their late fifties, with health impaired, they find themselves unable to fit into industry or business. The family has grown up and they are left without sufficient means to carry on.

I do feel that perhaps these widows, who have made a great contribution to the country because they have held the family together, are more deserving of pensions than some of the millionaires and very wealthy people who receive a \$40 a month old-age pension. I hope The Department of Welfare will take this into consideration. I know it would be appreciated, and I am sure the people of Ontario and of Canada would be glad to contribute to that type of pension.

We have had considerable discussion regarding the health and hospitalization plans which are proposed, and during this debate, I have heard the Blue Cross mentioned several times. I know the Blue Cross has done a great job, and I want to tell the House that in the rural parts we have co-operative medical services and they have done an equally good job for the rural people. They have given hospitalization and surgical insurance, and recently they have entered into the field of catastrophe insurance. In time, as you work out this hospitalization plan, if the benefits of this plan are given to the urban groups and the other groups first, the rural people will

be very unhappy. We have the co-operative hospitalization schemes which are in effect in most of our counties, and if the government needs an organization to step in and serve rural Ontario, it is there and can readily be expanded.

The people of my riding would want me to thank the various hon. members of the government for the way they have rendered service to them in the fields of health, education, welfare, hydro, conservation and municipal affairs. I know they would want me to especially thank the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) for the great improvements in our highway system, and the very generous grants to our municipal bodies. We trust we will see an extension of these improvements.

Roads mean more perhaps to rural Ontario than to any other part of our economy. Rural Ontario depends almost 100 per cent. on roads for transportation; 22.2 per cent. of the licenced trucks in Ontario are farm owned. The high cost of labour has forced agriculture to mechanize, and I would say that, with mechanization, the horse has almost disappeared, and the farm trucks have taken over.

I could tell you that 60 per cent. of the business communities in my riding have only one transportation system, and that is the motor transportation system. I could tell you that 100 per cent. of the dairy products are moved out of my riding by truck, as are nearly 90 per cent. of the livestock and about 90 per cent. of the produce.

When we consider the importance of motor transports to the rural people, the fact that for two months of the year—or one-sixth of the time—sizeable trucks in rural Ontario are restricted to half loads, I am wondering whether the government should not take another look at the cost of licences for the farm-owned trucks.

Many of these trucks are driven a very small mileage. When the switch came from horses to motorpower, the first thing that happened was the farmer took his products to town on a wagon behind a tractor. In the interests of

safety it was not a desirable thing for them to do so, and I think it is much more desirable for them to have their products moved by truck. I would suggest to the government that perhaps they check and find out the mileage the farm-owned trucks drive, and if they think it is fair and reasonable, they may have another look at the cost of the licences or perhaps could have a special licence to service rural Ontario.

I want to commend the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) on his sincere effort to reduce the accidents on our highways. We pay a terrific price for the privilege of driving a motor vehicle, a continual crippling and slaughter, and the property damage amounts to a tremendous figure.

I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Highways for his efforts to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Highway Safety which reported to the last Legislature. Many of our recommendations have already been implemented.

I was pleased to note in the Press the other day that signs are to be made uniform in Ontario. I think that is a very forward step which takes away confusion about the signs in the minds of people going from one municipality to another. I know this will be of great assistance to our New Canadians, people who are not as familiar with the English language as some of us.

I know there are some people who would tell you that unless a man can read English he should not have a licence, but I wonder what we would think if we went to the Province of Quebec, and they told us that if we could not read French we could not drive? After all, this country is bilingual, and if we look back on our own ancestry, we will not go back too far, until we find that some of our ancestors could not speak English either.

I want to commend the hon. Minister of Highways on his efforts to implement the recommendations of that committee. I suggested before, and I want to repeat, that I think the railways could make a great contribution to highway safety. The hon. Attorney-General

the other day told us how many accidents have been caused by collisions with trains in recent months.

I suggested before, and I want to repeat, that when the railways are repainting their boxcars, it seems to me they could use fluorescent paint, which would be visible at night. In the rural areas there are literally thousands of railway crossings which are unlighted, and in this way they could make a very great contribution to highway safety at no great expense.

I would like to make another suggestion and perhaps I should direct this to the hon. Attorney-General or the hon. Minister of Highways—I am not sure which. It is that we have rigid enforcement of the laws, that the laws should be made realistic. I am thinking now of two laws which have bothered me, and one is with regard to the second brake system.

If you read our Highway Traffic Act as it stands at the present time, you will find that a motor vehicle that is turned off the assembly line today has a second braking system which does not comply with the Act, and I would suggest if we feel that the brake is satisfactory, the Act be brought into line with what is generally accepted.

The motorist is in an impossible position if he is summonsed and charged under the specific section of the Act, because when he goes into court he realizes he has bought an automobile with a brake which does not comply with the Act.

Another suggestion is with regard to speed limits and speed zones. I think the committee recommended that the hon. Minister of Highways be given the power to set speed limits and speed zones, having regard to the type of road, volume of traffic, weather conditions and visibility, and I am convinced that the recommendation was sound. I felt it was sound at the time, because we cannot tell the people of Ontario that if a speed of 50 miles an hour on the Barrie Highway is right, it is right on a gravelled township road, or right on an access highway.

Then, we come to some of our towns, and we find the speed limit dropped to 30 miles an hour in the open country. I can tell you of one case of which I know at the present time, and that is in the Georgetown-Norval area on No. 7 Highway. In that area there is a 5½ mile stretch of 30-mile-an-hour zone, and yet only 1½ miles is built up. It is a situation such as this which destroys the usefulness of a good highway.

I realize that stretch of highway has been annexed into the town, and perhaps the municipality wants it that way. If they are trying to keep the people away from the town, they have succeeded very well, as far as I am concerned, because I once used that highway 4 or 5 times a week, and now I use it only that many times in a year. That kind of thing builds up resentment, when you have to come down to 30 miles an hour in the open country.

Another suggestion I would like to again make, is one I made a year ago, and that is that I am convinced the greatest contributing factor to highway accidents is not the vehicles, nor the roads, but rather the drivers themselves.

Our accidents are caused by people who lack a sense of responsibility, and the only way I can think of to give people a sense of responsibility is to hit them in the place where they feel it. So I would suggest that the government give their careful consideration to asking of the motorists the same thing they ask of the commercial truck drivers, and that is proof of financial responsibility.

I think if you check the latest available records, you will find the commercial operators have the best record of any group, and the reason for that is the fact that they have filed proof of financial responsibility; if they do not, they are out of business. I would suggest the same principle be applied to all motorists.

If you are going to drive on our highways, you should have to file proof that you are responsible for any damage you cause. I would suggest to the government that in this safety drive it gives great consideration to the question of

asking all motorists to file proof of financial responsibility.

I would like at this time to commend the Temperance Federation for what I believe is a very positive step in the interest of highway safety. I understand they are coming up with an insurance plan, where the rate will be greatly reduced for total abstainers. To me this is a positive step, and perhaps will have a great effect on curtailing or controlling the drunken driver.

After all, if a drunken driver is going to have to pay perhaps 50 per cent. more for his insurance, he will decide if he is going to drive he had better not drink.

Another suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister of Highways is that something should be done about the system of licencing vehicles, that the licence become the property of the purchaser rather than remain with the vehicle.

With the recent increase in licence fees we find the licence has a great deal more value and sometimes, shortly after you have bought your licence, you may want to change your vehicle. At the present time your licence goes into the used car lot and I can think of licences which run from \$3 up, right through to the large trucks running up to \$500, and it does not seem reasonable to me that a man who has paid \$500 for the privilege of operating a vehicle on the highway, should have that \$500 licence go into the used car lot, just because he sells his vehicle.

It may be impossible to make that change, but I suggest it be given consideration and I think it would be appreciated by automobile owners, and every one who purchases a motor vehicle licence.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say something about agriculture. After all, agriculture is the key industry in the riding I represent. Agriculture will always be the basic industry. If the day comes when farm people stop producing food, all of the other interests will die.

Everyone knows that agriculture is not in a healthy condition at the present time. We have lost many of our export



markets. Our elevators are full and the grain is piled on the farms in western Canada. Western farmers who cannot sell grain have turned to feeding livestock, thus creating surpluses of meat, poultry and dairy products.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the Federal Government shapes our trade policy, since they have control of tariffs, trade agreements and international financial policies. I suggest that they have failed to develop adequate export markets.

According to the Press, the federal Minister of Trade and Commerce says that farm surpluses are good for Canada. What about the farmer? Is the farmer a different type of Canadian from the labourer, the industrialist or the businessman?

Would any responsible Minister suggest they should put thousands out of work so that there may be a surplus of labour? Would anyone suggest that a percentage of our industry should be failing, so that we would have a surplus of industry, or would anyone suggest that a percentage of our businessmen should become bankrupt?

I do not think the hon. federal Minister will ever convince the farm people that farm surpluses are a good thing for Canada. If farm surpluses are a good thing, then the government has a right to put a floor under farm products, or give the farmer assistance in some way. The farm people are not asking for any special consideration: they ask only for the same consideration that is given to other groups in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to agriculture? I am now about to exhibit a chart to show how some of our costs have gone up. Using the period 1935 to 1939 as a base, our taxes on industry have advanced by 164.5 per cent.; gasoline, oil and grease by 172.8 per cent.; fertilizer 182.3 per cent.; seed 185.2 per cent.; hardware 194.1 per cent.; farm machinery 197.4 per cent.; feed 206.9 per cent.; binder twine 245.0 per cent.; building materials 284.5 per cent.; and farm wage rates 441.6 per cent.

The one bright spot in the picture in Ontario is the fact that this government went "all out" on a rural hydro extension programme. As far as I know, that is the only source of energy the farmer may buy today which is just about as cheap as it was in 1940.

That is what has happened on one side of the picture.

I want hon. members to look now at another chart, to see how farm prices have dropped. The latest figures I have are those for 1954. In 1951, the value of milk cows in Ontario was \$296 per head, in 1954 it was down to \$162; the value of other cattle in 1951 was \$165.50 per head, in 1954 it was down to \$94.76; the value of sheep and lambs in 1951 was \$34.46 per head, in 1954 it was down to \$21.52 per head; the value of swine in 1951 was \$39.87 per head, and in 1954 it was \$40.69 per head, which is about the same; the value of poultry in 1951 was \$1.50 per head, and in 1954 it was down to \$1.11.

The value of wool in 1951 was 80 cents per pound, and it was down in 1954 to 39 cents. The total value of milk production of Ontario was \$164,852,000, in 1954 that was down to \$157,430,000. The total value of principal field crops in 1951 was \$383,137,000, and in 1954 that had dropped to \$288,153,000.

Mr. Speaker, that is the picture. The problems of agriculture are 3-fold. There is, first, the loss of export markets for surplus. Then there is the rising cost of production and, thirdly, there is the fall in farm prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in terms of the administration and someone might ask, "What has this government done for agriculture?" I submit this government has done more for agriculture than any government in Canada. I mentioned a few minutes ago what the government has done to put hydro into the rural areas, completely changing the rural way of life. I may also mention our marketing legislation, which is the most advanced of any in Canada, giving to our farmers schemes where they have control over the marketing of their products.

I know that the government has critics, but the criticism is that the government has gone too far, that it has gone past the limit, with the result that we have an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, in order to find out if that be the case.

I know the farmers of Ontario are pleased to know that the Government of Ontario has gone to the limit, perhaps even past the limit; that it is ready to call a special session of the Legislature to help them out of their difficulty, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this government's policies have made rural Ontario a much more attractive place in which to live. I can show you what this government has done, by referring to a chart which will show what has happened in my own riding.

Naturally, I will have to give some background, so as to give a true picture and I will go back to 1943.

In 1943 the government of that day spent on the highways, on the county roads, the township roads and the urban roads in my riding—and, incidentally, they spent nothing on urban roads—\$221,109. Last year, this government spent on the same roads, \$2,441,308. In the field of health, the hospitals which serve the people I represent, received in 1943 a grant of \$17,883. Last year, the same hospitals received \$659,643.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to tell you that in 1941 only 25 per cent. of the farmers in Wellington-Dufferin had hydro, whereas 85 per cent. have hydro now. In Dufferin County, 19 per cent. had hydro in 1941, and 93 per cent. have it now.

I could mention that in 1943, there were no unconditional grants for the municipalities in my riding, nor for the municipalities in Ontario. Last year, in Ontario, the municipalities received \$12.5 million in unconditional grants. In 1943 the total assistance to municipalities and school boards of Ontario was \$18.3 million. Last year the municipalities and school boards received \$164.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, that is the job the Government of Ontario has been doing for the rural areas and for the municipalities. The over-all policies of this government—and I have just mentioned some of them—have made Ontario the most attractive province in which to establish a home, a business, or an industry.

We have 10 provinces in Canada; we have Liberal governments, we have CCF governments, we have a Social Credit government, we have Union Nationale, we have Coalition government; yet we find over half of the new industry, which has settled in Canada since the war, has settled in this Province of Ontario.

We find that over half of the new Canadians, with 10 provinces in which to establish a home, decide to establish their homes right here in Ontario. The population of Ontario has gone up since this government took office by 1,268,000.

The reason they are here is because of the sound over-all policies of this government.

MR. OLIVER : Oh, the hon. member is dead right there.

MR. ROOT : Now what do 1,268,000 people mean to agriculture? It is a market which did not exist when this government took office. And, thank Heaven, Mr. Speaker, some government has been developing markets.

This market is growing week by week, month by month and year by year, and I want to make use of a chart to show hon. members what this means to the farm people. All I am showing here is a per capita consumption, and by figuring it on an increase of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million people.

The latest available figures are for 1953, and I know that many of these figures are higher now than they were then. Nevertheless, the 1953 per capita consumption of pork, for instance, was 57 pounds, and if you add  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million to that, you will find that the policies of this government have created a market for nearly 75 million pounds of pork, which did not exist when it came into office.

They have created an additional market for 75 million pounds of beef, 12 million pounds of veal, about 45 million pounds of chicken and poultry, and about 45 million pounds of eggs.

MR. OLIVER: Pounds of eggs?

MR. ROOT: That is right, that is the way they show it.

MR. MANLEY: What about liquor?

MR. ROOT: I would not know. I do not drink.

Additional markets were created for 8 million pounds of cheese, over 500 million pounds of fluid milk—I see the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) has left his seat—about 25 million pounds of butter, about 10 million pounds of lard, about 180 million pounds of potatoes, 25 million pounds of tomatoes, and about 90 million pounds of fresh fruits.

With the per capita consumption, we find that with increased purchasing power which is in the hands of the urban consumer—we know there is more purchasing power than ever before—we find that the per capita consumption has increased.

I will give hon. members 4 or 5 instances: pork, about 20 pounds per capita, and that will take care of another 25 million pounds. About the same in beef. The increase in consumption of poultry products will take care of another 15 million pounds of poultry. Fresh fruits have gone up 20 pounds per capita, or 25 million pounds. Those are some of the things this government has done for rural Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: Just a few of them?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is surprised. He did not know he had done all that.

MR. ROOT: He does so many good things that I know he cannot keep track of them also.

MR. MANLEY: But his supporters keep reminding him of them.

MR. ROOT: Mr. Speaker, I want to say—and I am coming to the conclusion of my remarks—that the brightest spot for the farmers of Ontario is the fact that we have in Ontario sound, progressive government under the present hon. Prime Minister.

MR. OLIVER: And he sends prices down, down, down.

MR. ROOT: I think the hon. leader of the Opposition knows that prices were sent “down, down, down” because the government at Ottawa has failed to find export markets for them.

Our provincial tax is low. The benefits are many. I am going to make just a brief reference to the tax picture, because this is one of the reasons why people come to Ontario instead of going to other provinces.

In 1939, the Federal Government took, out of the national tax dollar, 51.2 per cent. The provincial governments took 18.8 per cent. and the Canadian municipal governments took 30 per cent. By 1955, the Federal Government had stepped up their tax to 74.8 per cent., the provincial governments across Canada had dropped to 10.1 per cent., and the Canadian municipal governments had dropped to 15.1 per cent., almost cut in half.

Now let us turn to the figures in Ontario. In 1938-39, the Federal Government took out of Ontario's tax dollar 52.1 per cent. In 1954-55, the Federal Government had increased their take from the Ontario tax dollar to 80 per cent., and I want hon. member to note that is over 5 per cent. higher than the average across Canada. The Provincial Government of Ontario in 1938-39 took 15.1 per cent. from each provincial tax dollar. That means that in 1954-55 this government has dropped their share to 6.3 per cent. Ontario municipal governments in 1939 were taking 32.8 per cent. Because of the great increase in federal “take,” the municipal share has dropped to 13.7 per cent.

In brief, that is the tax picture in Ontario at the present time, and I know our municipalities appreciate the fact that this government, out of its 6.3 per



cent. has been able to make the greatly increased grants to the municipalities which I mentioned a few moments ago.

I do not think anyone will challenge me when I say that Ontario is the key-stone in the arch of Confederation. Over half of the new people who have come to Canada have come to this Province of Ontario. Over half of the new industries in Canada have established here in Ontario. We pay half the national budget. Can any intelligent person deny that we have here in Ontario the best government in this whole Dominion of Canada?

The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), speaking the other day, said he had no solution whatsoever for the problem of agriculture. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could offer him one solution. I could offer him many more, but the hour is late. I would suggest that he forget that dream of his, that when an election comes again, he is going to beat

this government. He cannot beat good government, a government which works for the people, which has done so much for agriculture, which has stimulated all parts of our economy, one which is good for all of Canada.

Mr. J. Spooner (Cochrane South) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): In moving the adjournment of the House, may I inform hon. members we will continue the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 of the clock, p.m.











# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>The Workmen's Compensation Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading .....</b>  | <b>629</b> |
| <b>Conclusion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne,</b><br>Mr. Spooner, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Reaume, Mr. Nickle ..... | <b>629</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....</b>  | <b>666</b> |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

### THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. C. Daley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Would the hon. Minister care to say anything about this Bill?

HON. MR. DALEY: It is a very short Bill which has to do with increasing the maximum earnings from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the orders of the day, I would like to welcome to this Assembly, this afternoon, a group of students from Bradford High School, Beeton Public School, the Toronto Teachers' College, and the Ryerson Public School.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The annual report of the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police from January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1955.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. J. W. SPOONER (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in rising on this occasion, I do so with a deep feeling of humility, brought about by the responsibility I owe to the good people of my riding of Cochrane South; by the fact that my humble role with this government, under our great leader, hon. Prime Minister Frost, will have some effect on the lives of some 5¼ million souls in this Province of Ontario; and finally by the knowledge that a vast majority of the people of this world and their leaders are watching closely the workings of our way of life, many of them praying for its continuing success because they know its most valuable aspect is freedom.

Mr. Speaker, please accept my sincere congratulations on your elevation to your high position, and please permit me to say that the manner in which you have accepted your responsibilities, and have conducted this House, is proof of the many high qualities of leadership which you possess.

May I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the speech in reply to

the Speech from the Throne, and also to express my personal appreciation to the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Ministers of the government and to the hon. members from all sides of this House for the many kindnesses extended to me in my first session in this House.

As the representative of Cochrane South, I follow a man who was held in very high esteem in this Legislature for many years. I might say that Mr. Wm. Grummett is also held in high esteem in the riding I now have the honour and privilege to represent, and though he and I differ in our political philosophies, I am convinced Mr. Grummett was always sincere in the manner in which he served the interests of his people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I should tell you something about the background of the people of my riding. They are, first of all, of a pioneering character, the type of people who willingly faced the hardships of the frontier without fear, because "they were determined to succeed."

I am happy to relate to this House that among the very earliest persons in the Porcupine District, where I make my home, was an hon. Minister of this House in the person of the hon. George H. Dunbar, the Provincial Secretary, who on January 6, 1908, felled the first tree in what is now the thriving community of South Porcupine as the winter sun was setting over the hills of Kamiskotia. By the hard work and perseverance of such men, the fine communities extending from one end of the riding of Cochrane South to the other have been built.

These early settlers were rugged. As the saying goes, they were made of good "stuff." They cleared the land of trees and ploughed the virgin soil; they tramped the rocks; they faced the rigours of life in lumber and mining camps. They hunted; they toiled for gold; they built railroads; they raised their families; they prospered.

The War of 1914 found many of them in the service of Canada, some never to return. Others returned to pick up where they had left off—carried on

as before in building out of the northern wilderness a home to be proud of.

They were joined by hundreds of new people from the United Kingdom, from the United States, and from many countries of Europe—bringing to Canada and to northern Ontario their trades and their abilities, their culture, and their determination to succeed in a new land—side by side with the Canadians whom they some day hoped to hail as fellow-citizens.

In 1934 the price of gold was increased and this gave a great impetus to the mining development—new mines and new services of all kinds to furnish the needs these new ventures required. With the development of the mines the lumbering industry in all its phases of operation continued to expand. Agriculture increased its contribution to the economy of the north. New churches, new schools, new hospitals, new homes and municipal services of all kinds were added, as the need arose. Indeed, there was opened the way for all these people to express themselves, and they did it with such a "zeal" that this zeal today is called "the spirit of the north."

The young people, like their fathers before them, answered their country's call in 1939 and served valiantly in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force in the cause of freedom. In their service they brought credit to themselves, to their parents and to the north country. Our youth are known for their valour in sports, particularly in hockey. They too are determined to push the frontiers farther north. They need but the smallest opening, the slightest opportunity to succeed.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the new generation of young men and women is in the north with the same spirit and determination to succeed in the face of trying conditions. For the price of gold is still pegged at \$35 per ounce, and though the Federal Government's Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act has had most beneficial effects, the economy of the whole of the gold-mining areas is still tied to the price of the basic product of the area.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, I may in the few minutes at my disposal discuss with you and hon. members some points of provincial government policy which I think will be good investments for the north and for the Province of Ontario.

This government has served us well from the days of the building of the Ontario Northland Railway—and I must pay tribute to the fine service being provided by the present commission of this railroad and the able staffs in their employ. This railroad has consistently improved its service with new modern equipment, and I am confident it does all in its power to keep its freight and passenger rates in line with the economic conditions they must meet from time to time.

The highways in the north have been improved over the years to a point where No. 11 Highway, north from North Bay, is one of the finest roads in the province. But we have a great need for a highway to bisect No. 11 Highway from west to east to provide us with greater opportunities to open up new, and as yet practically untouched, areas for mining projects and for tourist attractions.

The great "greenstone" belt for mineral geology extends easterly from the Sudbury Basin through the Porcupine District with its gold, Matheson with its asbestos, Kirkland and Larder Lake with their gold, to Quebec with its gold and copper. It is known that much of that great country extending for many miles contains deposits of copper, gold, nickel, asbestos and many other minerals too numerous to mention.

The mines access road programme instituted by this government and stressed so much by the late hon. Welland S. Gemmell, and so ably continued by the present hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), have been of inestimable value in opening new areas to the mine developer, the prospector, and the timber operator. I cannot stress this too strongly, and recommend the continuance of this programme.

There is under construction at the present time a new highway from Kirk-

land Lake going north to Kenogami on No. 11 Highway. The people of the areas of Kirkland and Larder Lake will be well served by this new road, which will provide a first-class highway outlet to the north.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are only two comparatively short sections of a road to be constructed that would then give us a road from No. 17 Highway through Chapleau, Foleyet, Timmins, Matheson, and easterly to northern Quebec and Rouyn and Noranda.

I have already mentioned the mineral-bearing areas this would serve, and the forests it would make available, but I think a more important matter to stress is the tourist possibilities of the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, there is under construction at the present time a bridge at Mackinac Straits south of Sault Ste. Marie on the American side. There are about 35 to 40 million people living in 4 or 5 states to be served by this new bridge, which will permit automobiles to cross the straits in a few minutes as compared to the hours it now takes on a ferry. The crossings at the "Soo" will of necessity have to be improved.

There is one of our trump-cards, for with better facilities I feel certain the Americans will wish to travel into new hinterlands of northern Ontario to hunt and to fish, to spend a quiet vacation close to nature in areas they have not travelled before. Surely we have enough faith in ourselves to justify an investment in northern Ontario to produce more wealth and more prosperity for our people.

Mr. Speaker, the riding of Cochrane South needs additional industries to bolster and solidify its economy. The tourist industry with its dollars of new money can be very important. The municipalities of my riding are well equipped with services to handle a greater population. That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, why we have pressed so strongly upon this government, and upon the Government of Canada, that the natural gas pipe line should be an all-Canadian line, and that it should follow the northern route.



On July 12 last, at a meeting in Kirkland Lake of representatives of northern municipalities, it was unanimously agreed that it was our opinion that the pipe line must remain Canadian. We suggested by telegram to the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Frost), and to the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent), that both governments should undertake to assist this project by constructing the so-called "uneconomic" bridge of 675 miles from Manitoba through the north.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that this suggestion had been mentioned before—perhaps it has been—but I am sure the hon. Prime Minister was as much concerned as we were regarding this whole project and its success. Ontario needs this fuel energy and northern Ontario needs it for its continued existence and future development. Improvements in the economy of northern Ontario will rebound with beneficial effects on the continued prosperity of the industrial empire of the south.

Natural gas, I am sure, will provide the fuel energy for smelters to treat the copper ores of Temagami and Cobalt, the iron ores of Boston Creek, the base metals deposits of Kamiskotia and Matheson, will provide fuel for the pulp and paper industries of Iroquois Falls, Smooth Rock Falls and Kapuskasing. First and foremost, it should provide the home owner with a cheaper and more attractive fuel for domestic use. This government is to be commended for the passing of the necessary legislation to provide natural gas in Ontario. The north will ever be grateful for the foresight of this government in this respect, as well as many others.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my people in my riding are interested in assisting pensioners in case of need. I had the privilege, during the past few years during which I was mayor of Timmins, to work very closely with my council, our staff, and The Department of Welfare for the province in the construction of a home for the aged at Timmins which has been named "Golden Manor."

This home was officially opened on December 21 last by the hon. Mr. Cecile, Minister of Welfare, and will provide accommodation for 86 elderly persons. In the first two months of operation, this manor will be completely occupied by residents of the 4 municipalities of the Porcupine District, with a few persons from the unorganized territory around it. This indicates the need is great.

I hope the other municipalities in my riding will continue the studies they have started in the hope that before long other homes will be established.

There is another matter regarding welfare I would like to discuss, and that is the disabled persons' allowance. Until January 1, 1955, Ontario provided these allowances on what I think was a very excellent arrangement. If a person was in need and unable to earn a living on account of disability, he was entitled to a pension—but since the Government of Canada now shares in the expense, the regulations are much more strict and a number of person I know have had to revert back to municipal welfare.

The terms "totally and permanently disabled" within the meaning of the new regulations receive a literal and strict interpretation. The applicant must be totally disabled and furthermore unable to carry out activities pertaining to self-care and normal living without assistance of another person, and also permanently disabled in the sense that the disability cannot be corrected within the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that Ontario can lead again in the field of human welfare as was done before, by providing again a new allowance which might be called the "Province of Ontario Disabled Persons' Allowance" to provide for the disabled person in need without the qualification that some other person must assist him or her in "self-care and normal living."

I commend the government for its attitude respecting higher learning and the establishment of junior colleges throughout the province. I believe we must make educational facilities available closer to the students' homes for at

least the first few college years. The Haileybury School of Mines is fulfilling a most important service in the field of education in northeastern Ontario, and I hope that the government will soon study the needs we have for a junior college in my riding.

I think it is safe to say that we today in Canada are importing hundreds of technically-trained men and women because we do not graduate enough science degree men ourselves. The junior college will help to meet this national problem, and at the same time give many competent young people an opportunity they do not have today.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I cannot let the opportunity pass to say something more about the men of the north—the men who toil for gold in the bowels of the earth—and the men who toil on the farms, in the bush-lands and the mills. They are a hardy lot, but they need the security of a contributory hospital insurance plan, they need an increase in mining revenue payments to keep their municipalities strong financially, they need 60-cycle hydro power because now they have difficulty in obtaining 25-cycle equipment in many instances.

The large municipalities composed of unions of townships need more help in providing high school education, and the workers need a more liberal interpretation of some sections of The Workmen's Compensation Act, particularly in connection with silicosis pensions and permanent injuries.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the House recently about reform institutions, and I would like to speak about the Monteith Industrial Farm in my riding. This institution is well operated and is performing a very successful function. It is regrettable that some of our citizens run afoul of the law and become guests of the government. Nevertheless, they are entitled to accommodations which are as good as we can make them.

Therefore, I would like to recommend that we assist The Department of Reform Institutions in supporting the recommendations made by them some

time ago, that the Monteith Industrial Farm now be considered as a permanent institution, and not a temporary one, and that the buildings located there be replaced by permanent buildings.

Furthermore, perhaps the farm itself could be enlarged by the purchase of additional land in the area. I am sure that those who have to be there, at some time or other, would be better looked after if there were new and enlarged accommodations available for them.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to address this House today. I hope in these few minutes I have told you something of the county in which I live and the people whom I represent.

HON. A. KELSO ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address this House for a few minutes this afternoon, in this debate, I join with the other speakers who have preceded me in extending congratulations to you in the high office you now occupy. Your long years of service, both in this chamber and in the public service, have fitted you in a unique way for your high position, and you bring with you a good deal of experience which will not only help you but will assist all hon. members of the Legislature, over whose deliberations you now preside.

Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate the "baby of the House," the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Maloney), upon his excellent initial address in moving the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I know that much more will be heard from him as time goes on. To the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons), I express congratulations on his contribution in seconding that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I also take particular pleasure in rising in my place immediately after the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Spooner), who did what we would expect him to do for the people of his constituency and for the great north country which he, with other members from the north, so ably represent.

I was listening yesterday to the "twins," who sit across the chamber, who regaled this House with a great deal of humour, and who also gave us a great deal of informative and serious information. First, the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh), in his quest for termites, has suggested to this House that we should deal with this problem on a continental scale. That happens to be a scale for another type of quest, which I myself have been advocating, namely the quest for highway safety. Therefore, we have two problems, differing perhaps in size, but both on a continental scale.

The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) referred to "chickens imported from Louisiana." I am sure the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) will be surprised when I say that my wife and I were in Huntsville some weeks ago, and when she needed a new pair of mittens to go into the bush, she went into a well-known trading post at Huntsville and picked out an attractive pair. We looked to see where they were made, and found they were mittens made in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other matter to which I wish to refer, before I deal with the main points to which I wish to address myself today.

The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) on Monday last made his maiden speech here, and I compliment him on it. He made some reference to the proceedings under the Unsatisfied Judgments Fund. I would like to make this statement now. When presenting my Estimates later, I hope to have an opportunity of saying more about this matter, but at this point, I wish to say that last year, in the 12-months period, the Litigation Division of the civil side of The Department of the Attorney-General investigated, in the calendar year 1955, 802 cases, intervened in 591 cases, and effected settlement in 434 cases.

In addition, there were 49 applications for leave to sue the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, arising out of hit-and-run accidents, and there were 604 applications for payment out of the fund

of judgments obtained. That was for the calendar year, that is, for last year.

In the fiscal year 1954-55, ended March 31, of last year, \$1,808,314.43 was paid out in relation to these judgments and represented more than 90 per cent. of the contributions received during that year. Besides, as a result of a request I made only a matter of a couple of hours ago, The Department of Highways has been able to supply me with these figures for the calendar year 1955.

The amount of money paid into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, through the contribution of the motorists, was \$1,958,526.80. The amount paid out was \$1,932,464.41. That is in excess of 98 per cent. It would seem to me, therefore, that to the extent that there are funds available, and to the extent that there are claims referable to it, the administration of the fund has not been open to any serious criticism.

I can assure the House that payments are made with all due despatch, as soon as the plaintiffs' solicitors supply the necessary material, as required by the Act.

Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks I have received a great many communications from well-meaning people in all parts of our province, urging that I do my utmost to protect the youth of this province from the dangers of crime comics and salacious literature. This culminated last Friday in a brief being presented by a representative group, representing some 17 different organizations, and I think I should put the names of those organizations on the record. They are:

The Christian Social Council of Canada; Metropolitan Committee of Public Affairs of the YWCA; The Catholic Women's League of Canada; Parents' Action League of Ontario; Toronto Conference Women's Association of The United Church of Canada; Toronto Conference of The United Church; Women's Missionary Society; National Council of Jewish Women of Canada; Provincial Council of Women of Ontario; The Women's



Auxiliary of the Anglican Church; The Local Council of Women, Toronto; The Salvation Army; Toronto Baptist Women's Association; Toronto Baptist Church Council; The Baptist Women's Missionary Society of Ontario and Quebec; The Canadian School Trustees' Association; Federation of Catholic Parent-Teacher Associations of Ontario; Toronto Diocesan Board of the Women's Auxiliary of the Anglican Church.

I was informed by a spokesman for the delegation, Mrs. Isobel Ross—who is very well known to many hon. members of this House—that the IODE, while not making a practice of endorsing briefs of other organizations, had presented a brief in 1952, to the Senate of Canada, a committee of which was then investigating this same problem, and in general, they were very very much in accord with this brief.

I was also informed that the Ontario Teachers' Federation and the Public Trustees' Association of Ontario are studying the brief with a view to possible endorsement of it at an early date.

I would like to refer to the brief and quote two or three sentences, to indicate what is contained in it:

Over the months there has developed a widespread conviction that something should and must be done to meet and overcome the menace of obscene and indecent publications. Much of the so-called literature flooding book stores of Ontario today can best be described as an "pornography for profit".

The second quotation from the brief is:

While firmly opposed to any suppression of idea formation through censorship, it is our conviction that there is a wide difference between that and the drawing of a line of demarcation as to what is decent and what is indecent.

Our concern is solely whether these periodicals, whether they be pornographic or immoral, should be called "obscene" and "indecent".

The brief goes on to say how difficult it is to determine what is meant by "decent" and "indecent" and asks me to petition the hon. Minister of Justice at Ottawa to set up a small committee to attempt to arrive at a satisfactory and workable definition. I am also requested to set up a review board, and in that connection I will quote from the brief again, as follows:

We strongly recommend that the Attorney-General give serious consideration to the setting up of a representative review board which could advise him regarding the presence and sale of obscene publications in this province.

In the discussion, they said they felt one representative from the publishers should be included.

The brief concludes with these words:

Recognizing this fact, the various groups and organizations which we have the honour to represent, pledge themselves to a renewed effort by precept and example, to improve the moral tone of this province.

and asks the assistance of those charged with the responsibility for law enforcement to deal with the problem of the sale and distribution of "indecent and obscene publications" in this province.

With the above background, I would like to make a few comments.

Freedom of expression, with respect to speech, discussion and opinion, while an original freedom, is not an unrestricted freedom. Therefore we have in our laws provision for infringements or violations by way of civil actions or criminal procedures. Civil rights can be maintained against defamation, assault, false imprisonment and the like, and the punishments under the Criminal Code are provided, which, of course, are federal statutes.

A great writer once said of literature: "The most seductive, the most deceiving, the most dangerous of professions." In this field, those words are very significant.

Section 150 of the Criminal Code contains the penalties and outlines the

crimes in relation to this matter. I would draw the attention of the hon. members of this House to section 150, section 1(b) :

Everyone commits an offence who makes, prints, publishes, distributes, sells or has in his possession for the purpose of publication, distribution or circulation a crime comic.

By subsection 7, a "crime comic" is defined as :

a magazine, periodical or book that exclusively or substantially comprises matters depicting pictorially (a) the commission of crimes, real or fictitious, or (b) events connected with the commission of crimes, real or fictitious whether occurring before or after the commission of the crime.

The same section also deals with obscene and indecent material generally.

It is interesting also to note that in defence the accused may show the material was for the public good. It is also provided :

Where an accused is charged with any of these offences, the fact that he was ignorant of the nature or presence of the matter, crime, etc. by means of or in relation to which the offence was committed, is not a defence to the charge.

So that ignorance, as to content under the Criminal Code, is no defence.

The English Act which was passed last year is entitled "An Act to prevent the Dissemination of Certain Pictorial Publications Harmful to Children and Young Persons." It is limited to young people while—as you will find the Criminal Code is not—to any age. The English Act does limit to young persons." The English Act makes ignorance a defence, or permits ignorance of the contents to be raised as a defence.

The penalties are quite severe because under the indictable provisions of the Code, a penalty can be imposed up to two years in prison, or, in the case of a corporation, there is no limit to the amount of the dollar fine which may be imposed.

With regard to summary convictions: proceedings can also be brought under The Summary Convictions Act summarily before a magistrate, where the penalty, of course, is limited to 6 months in prison or \$1,000 fine.

My attention has been drawn also to the Connecticut Act, but that Act, after examination, reveals that it is limited to children 18 years and under, and there is nothing in it which is not already covered by the Code in our view.

The English Act to which I have referred, has certain features as to powers of search, to seize and forfeit the printing press, material, and so forth, if it offends. Also, it contains an importing prohibition so that in a country such as Great Britain, with a prohibition against importing this particular type of literature, together with strict internal control of the publications, they are able to give effective control, in my opinion.

However, with regard to importing, I would like to say that the special committee of the Senate of Canada, which brought in its report 3 years ago, draws attention, at page 244 of the printed material, to the effect that ever since 1867, there has been in force the following prohibition to importation in the Customs and Excise Division schedules of the customs tariff :

Books, printed paper, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable or seditious or of an immoral or indecent character.

It will be seen then that such material can be prevented from importation.

The recommendation of the committee three years ago was :

Your committee recommends that the Excise and Customs Division of The Department of National Revenues expand its operations to meet proportionately the present serious threats to the moral standards of Canada.

How far they have gone is not indicated, but the fact that I have had so many communications recently would

seem to indicate, in all probability, they have not gone nearly far enough.

Section 153 of the Criminal Code provides an offence for using the mails of Canada for distributing material of this sort.

The Judicature Act—coming to the provisions in the field of this Legislature—section 16, contains the provision for obtaining injunctions, and subsection 2 is of particular merit in relation to this subject matter. It reads:

An action may be brought in the Supreme Court of Ontario by or on behalf of the Attorney-General for an injunction or mandamus restraining the publication of any newspaper, publication, pamphlet, magazine, periodical or other printed matter whatsoever which publishes continuously or repeatedly writings or articles which are obscene, immoral, or otherwise injurious to public morals.

Subsection 6 says:

An action under subsection 2 or 3 may be brought against anyone printing, publishing, or distributing any publication of any kind mentioned in subsection 2.

In 1940, when the hon. members opposite—or some of them—were sitting on this side of the House, the then Attorney-General instituted an action under this section known as the “Koy-nak case” and the late Mr. Justice Gerald Kelly held that in that particular case, where morals were involved, the provincial statute invaded the federal field of criminal law. Consequently he refused, on that occasion, to grant an injunction.

In doing that, he went counter to a much more senior judge, the late Chief Justice Rose, who had held shortly before that the section was *intra vires* and not *ultra vires* of the Provincial Legislature.

Since 1940, no procedures have been instituted under that section; however, I feel that the case would not hold at a higher level, and I refer particularly to the fact that we have, in our daily prac-

tices, many instances of this sort of thing. In the field of nuisances, we have both the criminal application of the Criminal Code, and the civil application of our own Statutes dealing with the same subject matter.

In the field of criminal negligence on our highways, we are constantly having both taking place at the same time. In the field of labour relations, there is provision in the Criminal Code with respect to “besetting”, “illegal picketing”, and so forth. Section 17 of The Judicature Act, following the section I have just quoted, limits to 4 days’ duration any *ex-parte* injunction granted under the labour section. We have the two actions running side by side, one in the civil field, by way of injunction, and one in the criminal field, under the federal Code.

Therefore, if occasion should arise where a situation might require action under The Judicature Act by way of injunction, it would, on advice of the Crown legal officers, be another means of proceeding to correct this situation.

The test of “obscenity” in an old case, in 1868, I think is still the law as far as our courts’ interpretations are concerned. The test is this:

whether the tendency of the matter is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands the publication may fall.

The fact that what has or has not a tendency to corrupt in one generation, may differ in another generation, does not necessarily change the formula or the test, because the test remains the same at the time of the hearing, the “tendency to corrupt.”

I have in my hand some pamphlets which were sent to me a few days ago by one of the correspondents I have mentioned, and which may very well illustrate whom they might “tend to corrupt,” and whom they might “not tend to corrupt,” for the problem is definitely a difficult one.

I might mention a recent trial in Ottawa—there seems to be a great deal



going on in Ottawa these days—of Regina *vs.* American News Company Limited. The decision which was rendered by His Honour, Judge J. deN. Kennedy last Thursday, I think is of sufficient importance and relevancy so that I might refer in detail to the sentence, because it seems to me to be very much in point in relation to this problem at this time:

Regarding the penalty, there is no doubt in my mind that the writing, publishing, and distribution of obscene books and magazines is a very big and profitable business.

I am quoting from the court reporters' recording of the sentence.

The extent to which such books and magazines are flooding into Canada, mostly from the United States, can be seen by a cursory examination of the shelves of most news stands in any of our cities and towns.

I think it is fair to state that there are publishers and distributors of paper covered editions of books and of magazines who recognize the commercial value of obscenity to the extent that they tend to exaggerate the off-coloured contents of such books and magazines by dressing them up with pictures on the covers deliberately created to whet the appetite of a prospective purchaser.

It seems to me that the only way to stop this traffic in obscenity is to impose fines that take away the profits of obscenity, and whenever it is possible to do so to impose prison sentences.

There have been other prosecutions for obscenity in this county where nominal fines were imposed as a warning and such warning has not been heeded. For the reasons mentioned, in my opinion there must be imposed in this case a substantial fine, and I hereby fine the accused, American News Company, Limited, \$5,000.

MR. NIXON: May I ask the hon. Attorney-General who initiated the action in this case?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The action was initiated by the Crown Attorney in the usual way. The Crown Attorney is a full-time Crown Attorney, Mr. Raoul Mercier, about whom I will speak in a moment.

MR. NIXON: On instructions by your department?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Yes. I was going to mention Mr. Mercier in just a moment, but before I do that, I would like to say the Deputy Minister of Welfare drew to my attention the fact that in New York State, a commission has been sitting, conducting an investigation and hearing evidence along the same line I have just been discussing here, and a majority of witnesses appear to favour a state committee of review. One of the leading district attorneys in Brooklyn, when questioned, said he was satisfied that the penalties provided by law were adequate but the imposition of them by the courts was too lenient.

In conclusion, I will answer the hon. member for Brant. I would like to mention Mr. Raoul Mercier. Effective prosecutions under the Criminal Code, such as the one just concluded in Ottawa, after a lengthy trial which was conducted on behalf of the Crown by Crown Attorney Raoul Mercier of Ottawa—who was, by the way, a classmate at Osgoode Hall of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle), the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett), and myself—together with sensible use of the injunctive procedure, if found available, joined with the efforts of an educative and guiding nature by organizations, such as I have mentioned, and by the main body of publishers, should make great strides in closing the gap in this troublesome and moral-upsetting problem.

This government, I am sure, will do its best with this sort of co-operation to bring about a fair and lasting result.

MR. R. GISBORN (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, first, that I am very proud to be a member of this Legislature and, in accepting the candidacy for the riding of Wentworth East and subsequently being elected, I have a duty-bound obligation to give honest and sincere representation to the citizens of my constituency, and to give my best consideration to the policy and legislation of the government on behalf of the citizens of Ontario.

I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your being elected Speaker of the House.

I also wish to offer my appreciation to the hon. Ministers and their deputies for their friendly co-operation, when I have had need to seek information on behalf of my constituents and in regard to my position as a member of this Legislature.

The new riding of Wentworth East, part urban, part rural, has many problems not found in a riding of strictly urban or rural location. In the suburban section of Wentworth East, we have the aftermath of previous annexation, unsettled, poorly planned and poorly serviced, and to these matters, I feel the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Goodfellow) and the Municipal Board should give considerable attention.

The City of Hamilton made application to annex a portion of Saltfleet Township in March, 1953, almost 3 years ago, and the decision to allow annexation was brought down just last week. This long delay has caused considerable inconvenience and indecision to the citizens of the annexed areas.

The township councils would do nothing about their many problems: drainage, flooding of cellars and properties, cost of sending children to the City of Hamilton schools because of the distance necessary to travel, and the hazards of highway crossing to reach the township schools. So I would say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, that municipalities applying to annex lands should be made to put before the people concerned a plan of their intended

programme regarding zoning—residential, industrial, commercial—school facilities, water and sewage services, fire and police protection, and some reasonable guarantee of when the plan would be put into effect.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, in watching a great ambitious city like Hamilton grow in the past 30 years, that the citizens of suburban or annexed areas are a forgotten group in regard to the services they are entitled to. They have to complain and complain for years for sewers, sidewalks and streets, lighting and transportation services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be some complexities in the duties and the rights and administration of the Municipal Affairs Department with which I am not familiar, but I have mentioned the problems of annexation as I have seen them in my brief activities in municipal affairs. I realize that progress must continue, and that cities must expand, but I feel that the citizens of the areas affected should be given more consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about a very serious problem in the rural part of the riding of Wentworth East and of the riding of Lincoln—the riding represented by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). This is a problem I'm sure many of the hon. members of this government are aware of; that is, the problem of lake shore erosion from Niagara-on-the-Lake to the southwest section of Lake Ontario at Van Wagner's Beach.

I know very little of the technicalities of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, or the effects of high water or low water on the shore line of Lake Ontario. But in my association with the Lake Shore Protection Association, with whom I have met on many occasions, and whom I know have been bringing to the attention of this government and the Federal Government the problem of shore erosion in their respective districts, and who have worked so hard and so long with sincere determination,

I feel that there is considerable justification in their complaint. I would like to point out, just a few of the reasons why their complaint should be given some consideration.

I wish to quote, in part, from a report given to the *St. Catharines Standard*, January 16, 1956, by Mr. Albert Holland, president of the Lake Shore Protection Association:

There is an old man living in a little house on the lake shore not far from here. There are a few acres and a barn which has been moved back once. Due to the washing of the waves there are only a few feet between the house and the lake. The old man is lame now and unable to do much work, but as he gets an extra dollar he takes his small truck and hauls as much stone as he can afford and dumps it on the bank to try and save his home.

Further along there are two old ladies with only a yard or two between what they call "home" and the dark cold waters of the lake.

A little further on is a widow whose husband suffered a heart attack while trying to help protect his home.

Another man has spent \$26,000 on protection, and still his land is inundated when the levels of the lake rise much above 246 feet. And in the name of progress the "Powers that Be" have sanctioned a 248-foot maximum level.

Many of these property owners, or their sons, joined Canada's Armed Forces, leaving their loved ones and the comforts of home behind, to fight for, and in some instance, to give their lives for this Canada of ours, and we feel it is only right that what is left of their homesteads should be salvaged and protected to the best of our ability.

I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to quote from a letter from a Mr. Don McCollum, a resident on the lake shore at Winona:

DEAR MR. GIBBORN:

As requested by hon. Mr. Nickle, Minister of Planning and Development, at the meeting of the Lake Ontario Property Protective Association with the Ministers of Planning and Development and Municipal Affairs, and the Vice-Chairman of the Hydro Power Commission and the Chief Engineer of the Dept. of Conservation, I hereby submit my report of damage and loss sustained by me since 1945, caused by erosion and high water on Lake Ontario.

In 1945, 5 feet of soil was lost to the lake over the entire length of my property, approximately 800 feet.

In 1946, twelve feet of soil was lost, and I had to move two houses—one house 36 by 24 feet, the other 26 by 26 feet.

In 1947, I lost another 20 feet of soil, and many of my 100-year-old ash and elm trees, which lined the lake-shore, and also a filtered well, worth \$500. I drove piles costing \$1,100 that year in an effort to protect my shore-line, but owing to the fact that my neighbours did not protect their property, they only functioned for two years.

In 1948, little damage was done in the area where the piles were located, but I lost about 4 feet of soil and cement pier farther east. The year 1949 saw little damage done.

In 1950, I lost a second filtered well and a pump house behind it. This well, when installed, was built about 60 feet from the water's edge. In the fall of that year the waves went through one of the cottages and deposited two truck-loads of sand and rocks in the living room. When this cottage was built in 1933, the tenants used to pitch horse-shoes on the lawn between the house and the lake.

In 1951, I lost more land, and my roadway, which was a right-of-way across my neighbour's property, 1,200 feet in length. My neighbour allowed myself, and the other land-owners involved, to buy a new way out at a cost of \$1,200, with the understanding that we pay all expenses incurred. The loss of that scenic drive depreciated the value of my property considerably.

In 1952, the high water ruined 1½ acres of grapes, the loss in vines, posts and wires being about \$400.

In 1953, it was necessary to move another house. This was a winterized house, and when built in 1934, was 125 feet from the water. The lawn and six 75-year-old trees have completely gone, and only sand and debris remain.

There was little damage done in 1954.

This year there has been little damage done except during Hurricane Connie. At that time I lost 10 feet of soil, and more large trees, and one tenant left on account of backed-up sewage.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) DON MCCOLLUM



Mr. Speaker, at the southwestern section of the lake, at Crescent Beach and Van Wagner's Beach, severe damage was caused by Hurricane Connie. At Crescent Beach alone there was over \$12,000 worth of damage done, involving 24 homes, ranging from \$75 to \$2,000.

I realize that damage from inundation and waves differs somewhat from the problem of shore erosion, but I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that if these people had not fought hard for the period of 24 hours, filling and piling sand bags, there would have been more extensive damage to roads and highways and more expensive properties.

I feel there should be an emergency fund set up in case of these abnormal storms in vulnerable areas, and some protective action taken.

During the first session of the 24th Legislature this government set up a select committee to study the problems of lake shore erosion and in spending considerable time and expense brought in a very excellent report. I feel that many of the hon. members in this House will agree there is a serious problem, particularly on the Niagara Peninsula. I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, a few lines from page 25 of the select committee's report re the Niagara fruit belt, which I feel gives some support to the seriousness of the problem:

The southern shore of Lake Ontario from the Niagara River to Hamilton has been subject to lake shore erosion of a very serious nature. The land lying between the Niagara escarpment and the lake front varies in breadth from 6 miles on the east to less than one mile just west of Grimsby.

This relatively small area of approximately 65,000 acres is one of the most productive and valuable areas in Canada for the production of peaches and other fruit. Farm land assessments vary from \$100 to \$200 per acre, and residential property from \$100 to \$150 per foot. The committee has been advised that the value of farm lands in this area is from \$1,000 to \$1,200 per acre.

Mr. D. G. Ure, an Ontario land surveyor at St. Catharines, supplied survey records on the rate of erosion for the townships fronting Lake Ontario in Lincoln County. These data are set out in Table No. 1. They indicate that the easterly townships of Niagara and Grantham, which occupy a more exposed position on the shore, are being eroded more than twice as rapidly as the townships further west.

The fact that the eastern shores have more sand and till in their formation than the western shores, which are chiefly shale, accounts in part for the difference in rate of erosion in this section.

It is also noted that the rate of erosion during the past 3 years when Lake Ontario has been at a high stage has greatly exceeded the rate of erosion prior to 1949. Data on the amounts and rates of erosion since 1932 on Lot 1, Con, I of Grantham Township have been submitted by Mr. Ure and are shown on Plate No. 4.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my way I have attempted to bring to the Legislature the problem of lake shore erosion in my riding. I'm sure many hon. members are more aware of the facts than I, but I do feel there is just reason for a committee to be constituted from this House to look into the problem in regard to compensation for losses sustained and remedial action for the future.

I would like to refer briefly to the peninsula generally as a fruit belt. The ever increasing encroachment of buildings on this most valuable land has caused much concern to the people of this area. I feel that these alarms are serious. In the last 15 years almost one-quarter of the fruit belt has been devoured by buildings. I feel that the Province of Ontario should be very interested in seeing to it that the only area in Ontario that can produce the agricultural products that come from this small belt is protected from uncontrolled destruction, simply because of real estate values.

The urban area of the riding of Wentworth East is made up mostly of working people, and their problems are the problems shared by all working people of the province.

At the time the Progressive Conservative Government took power in the Province of Ontario, working people found themselves under wage conditions which kept their living standards very close to the depression levels. It also kept corporations in the favourable position they found themselves in, as a result of heavy demand and low cost, a guaranteed market for all they could produce, with almost maximum cost limitations and many devious means of breaking the price controls which had been rather feebly policed.

This meant that the ordinary working man had tremendous economic pressure brought to bear upon him, and in this period tremendous organization strides were made by the labour movement because people realized that they needed an organized voice through which to speak, if they were going to be able to improve their position and have their fair share of the goods and services they provided.

At the time the Progressive Conservative Government took over in this province, there were approximately 200,000 members in the Canadian Congress of Labour, to which I belong. Today, this figure is more than double and a similar growth has taken place in the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, although it has always been somewhat the larger.

Today, there is almost a certainty that these two sections of labour will form a single united labour movement, because it is well recognized that only when labour speaks with the strongest single organized voice will they be able to have sufficient influence to be sure they will, in the future, be able to attain their full share.

As a workingman in a steel plant, one who had to go to work at the age of 12, I know the feeling of the people in this area of our economy. I know the feeling of lining up in a relief line

during the thirties for a handout of underwear and for a work ticket. I know the feeling of coming home from work in the steel plant in 1944 and finding a "for sale" sign on my house, which I had had to purchase for a price beyond my means because of a shortage of houses, on borrowed money.

I know the frustrations the working people felt when they saw the enormous amounts of goods being made for the war effort, out of which the companies and corporations were taking fantastic profits, and out of which workers were still getting too little in order to live in any kind of decent way. Workers were determined, when the war ended, to see this lopsided division of the wealth was rectified.

At this time, we see a great many serious strikes here in Canada, because the corporations of this country and particularly in this province would only give little by little—and then only after being forced to do so—any part of the privileged position they had acquired. There were no vacations. People worked very long hours at very low wages and they would take no more of it without raising their voices in opposition.

Fear ruled in our plants; fear of your foreman, fear of losing your job, fear of becoming ill or being hurt and thus not being able to provide for your family. There was no dignity in the Ontario workmen in our factories.

Some of these things changed as the years went by, but again the frustrations are being felt. Again the frustrations are causing long and bitter strikes. There is a difference this time, however. Most of the frustration is caused by the long delays in settling workers' grievances through arbitration—the long delays that the conciliation procedure allows in bringing about contract settlements.

The arbitration of grievances is a final court of justice in the settlement of workers' grievances in the plants. The inability to get chairmen for arbitration boards; the delay by the companies in appointing nominees to arbitration boards, have meant that

grievances at arbitration, are settled many months after the institution of such grievances—in some cases well over a year.

This is also true with conciliation. If these procedures were intended to bring about just settlements in the disputes which arise between management and labour, then it is no wonder the frustrations are growing and causing bitterness, because it has long been an adage in British Law that "justice delayed is justice denied."

This government can do much to correct these delays. At present, according to an Ontario Federation of Labour Research *Bulletin*, the average conciliation case takes 28 weeks. Under the legal limits set out in the Act, there should be no difficulty in processing any case under conciliation within 12 weeks. Only the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has the power, under the Act, to extend the legal limit. This matter could be improved a great deal just by the hon. Minister insisting that the time limits of the Act be lived up to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a Research Survey by the Ontario Federation of Labour, completed in December, 1955. It is quite lengthy and I do not wish to take up time here by quoting many figures. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to table the bulletin and have it recorded in *Hansard*, so that the hon. members may read it at their convenience, because I feel, Mr. Speaker, that all of the hon. members are not aware of this problem.

Arbitration and conciliation proceedings under The Labour Relations Act could be improved by a reduction of time limits and the enforcement of current time limits, and in the instance of arbitration, the establishment of time limits.

This government should also pay more attention to the safe operation of our factories. The inspection, under The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, is woefully inadequate, and regulations should be adopted in which both management and labour have a voice governing every section of industry which comes under this Act.

I want to urge the government to give leadership in two or three fields which would help maintain some economic stability, and would create further stability for the workers in this province.

First, there seems no logical reason why workers should lose pension credits they have built up with one employer because they change their employment and spend their working life with more than one employer. If these pension credits could be centralized through a government agency and carried by a worker until he reached retirement age, many more workers would qualify for pensions and between the ages of 65 and 70 would not have to call on the Provincial Government for aid under The Old Age Assistance Act.

Fewer workers would become a charge on the community directly, and a method of providing for themselves in their old age in an orderly fashion would have been created. I urge this government to take this point under consideration, and to give the necessary leadership to promote it among the employers in this province. I fully realize it would work better on a national scale, but that is no excuse for this province not to give the necessary leadership.

Secondly, there seems to me to be no reason why a worker's family should be deprived of the necessities of life because the bread-winner has fallen sick, through other than an industrial accident. This province can and should give leadership in establishing an insurance programme which would insure the worker from loss of earnings, while he was sick, in a manner similar to the insurance of workers' earnings under The Workmen's Compensation Act. There seems, further, to be no excuse, either under such sickness insurance or under The Workmen's Compensation Act itself, for provision for less than 100 per cent. of the worker's earnings.

The Speech from the Throne foreshadowed a hospital insurance programme. I want to urge the government not to provide deterrents or the necessity for co-insurance. The need of working people, whether they are urban, suburban or rural, is for a complete



hospitalization programme which will protect them from the heavy costs of hospitalization when they can least afford to pay it.

To date, we have no details on this plan, but it would seem to me to be a denial of the wishes of the people if anything less than a complete hospitalization insurance programme were instituted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of this House may wonder why, after making such strides, members of labour unions could be so seriously frustrated. I would like to interpret their thinking for you in this way.

In relation to today's costs and in relation to today's profits by corporations, the workers in industry generally do not feel they have made substantial gains. They know their living standards are higher, but they are also aware that they are not yet receiving their fair share, even in our better union agreements. In some industries, the workers have fallen far behind the relative position they had held.

In this light, it is quite readily seen that time delays, which are caused by legislation or by the administration of legislation, in themselves frustrate the attempts of the workers to improve their position. In addition to this our workers are now only beginning to understand how much there is to share in, and they are no longer going to be ruled by fear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that, in the words of our government and their supporters in the past weeks that this House has been in session, to the effect that we have a very prosperous and continually expanding economy, this is proof that the trade union movement has never been a detriment to our economy, but, on the contrary, it has been an impetus to the technological progress in our expansion.

I feel that the workers have done their job well in using their purchasing power to the fullest capacity. If the employer is going to continue to receive his profits and the worker his wages, then the worker must continue to consume his product to the largest possible degree.

These products are put on the market and advertised through all possible mediums. The worker is entitled to buy them, he has the right to buy them and he does buy them, in most cases on the instalment plan at prices 12 to 24 per cent. higher than the selling price. I feel, Mr. Speaker, this points out the necessary justification for workers to seek increases in wages, so that they can continue to purchase those things they produce. They must consume to produce.

There is great need for more low-cost housing units in the Hamilton area. We have two housing projects in Hamilton, which are on a partnership basis between the federal, provincial and municipal governments.

Under the Roxborough Survey, which was completed a couple of years ago, the units are shown which rent for a minimum of \$58 and a maximum of \$68 per month. In this housing survey, the housing authority is one year behind in dealing with applicants, and they have been receiving applications at the rate of 8 to 10 per week. The housing authority estimated that at least 200 to 400 applicants have not been placed.

In this project, the income stipulations are a minimum monthly income of 4 times the rent charged, and a maximum monthly income of 6 times the rent charged. You are required to have a minimum of two children to qualify.

The Mohawk Gardens Survey is being built up by means of moving existing Central Mortgage and Housing houses, which were turned over to them from the "wartime housing," and bringing them up to minimum city standards.

There will be a total of 448 houses in this survey, and rents will range from \$45.50 to \$59.50, including water rates. These are 4 and 6 room houses. The monthly-earnings qualifications are a minimum of 4 times the monthly rent and a maximum of 6 times the monthly rent. To date there have been 1,115 applicants for these homes. There is no flexibility in the earnings qualifications.

I might say that there is a backlog of something around 700 in low rent homes—that is, those ranging from \$45.50 to

\$59.50 per month and a backlog of 200 to 400 homes in the \$58 to \$68 bracket, or a total of 1,100 unfilled applications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our housing is more than a dollar-and-cents proposition; it is a great moral and social problem. I refer to our run-down old districts in our cities, where 3 and sometimes more families are living in buildings large enough for only one; where small children are subjected to being within a block or two of beer taverns and pool-room hangouts. I feel this government should look into a redevelopment programme in this regard. We must get rid of some of these homes that are unfit for habitation, homes that are fire hazards, homes in these areas which may breed crimes and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present some of the problems as I have seen them. Just previous to the commencement of this session of the House, I was doing my routine duties as a steel-worker in the plant and looking into the grievances of my riding. Coming to the Parliament Buildings in the first week, I noticed at once the friendly attitude and welcome of the hon. members, also the many professions of hon. members. I found many lawyers, business men, farmers and factory workers, and the good men of the cloth.

As a new member from a new riding, I intend to give my best. I feel that we in this House have to give leadership; we must have imagination, common sense and integrity sufficient to deal with the real problems of the people.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am concerned about the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth East, in which he suggested he should be allowed to place on *Hansard* the survey conducted, I believe, by one of the trade union organizations. I do not wish what I am saying to be construed as opposed particularly to what the hon. member seeks to do; but I am concerned with the possibilities which might flow if this were allowed to go on *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to rule on it, because we do not know what is in the brief. We have no way of knowing, and I doubt if it should be put on *Hansard*.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think a solution would be that the hon. member for Wentworth East should table the statement, if he wishes to do so. I do not think it should go into *Hansard* unless it is delivered and read. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is quite correct in that point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: *Hansard* is a record of the debates and if there is anything to be tabled, as a statement, it is just tabled and is not entered in *Hansard* in the ordinary way.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, a precedent has been created, and I hope that in future we will follow it.

HON. MR. FROST: Where was the precedent?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): I think it has been customary on previous occasions for an hon. member, when speaking to the House, to say he was not going to read something, but would like it on *Hansard*, and on many occasions it has been agreed to permit that.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to have it in *Hansard*, I suggest that during the debate on the Budget, he read it in.

MR. GISBORN: Mr. Speaker, I understood that the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) did the same thing when he spoke yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: There have been occasions where it occurred by consent, but it is not the usual custom. I think from now on, I will rule that a document will have to be read into the records of the House.

MR. GISBORN: Mr. Speaker, may I accept it that this will be placed on *Hansard*?

MR. SPEAKER: I think, under the circumstances, we will take it that does include speeches today. In future, as from today, this ruling will take effect.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that what I am referring to here is in connection with the reports of the proceedings of the House. As a matter of fact, I have just been reading a speech I delivered myself. If I were to present a statement now, and refer to it, and then ask that it be placed in *Hansard*, it would place an intolerable burden on the House and on *Hansard*. Why in the world should we ever permit such statements and briefs and what-not to be printed in *Hansard*? We could not supply *Hansard* to the people of Ontario at \$3.00 a year if that were done.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member say if the statement is very lengthy?

MR. GISBORN: Mr. Speaker, we had a precedent yesterday in which the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) handed something to *Hansard* to be entered into it, and there was no quarrel nor question about it. Since there was not any question, I am sure the hon. members expected the same would occur today.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I can quite understand, for instance, if an hon. member had a table of figures or something of that sort, which is part of his speech, very clearly it ought to go into *Hansard*. He may refer to a table, but there is a difference, when it is a brief or a separate paper or something else. It would seem to me that it would cause a great deal of trouble.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the hon. member read this particular document now.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, we would like to take a vote tonight, and, rather than postpone it, I am prepared to recommend that the statement be given to *Hansard*; but I would like to have the situation cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: From now on, hon. members will not be permitted to give anything to *Hansard* other than what they deliver by word of mouth during the debates.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, subject to this, I do not wish to bar any hon. member from placing a table or record or something of that sort. I think it is perfectly obvious and perfectly proper, but perhaps it does create a situation which should not be carried on in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that all the hon. member was doing was entering a table on *Hansard*. I may be wrong.

MR. GISBORN: Mr. Speaker, this is just a table. I do not think it is any more lengthy than I have seen before.

MR. NIXON: The whole thing?

MR. GISBORN: Mere figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may table the section containing the figures.

MR. A. REAUME (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, the office of Speaker is an important one in all parliaments where we find the people are free. It is always occupied by a very important person. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) could have appointed a better man for the office of Speaker. Every hon. member can feel certain that we will receive rulings which are equitable and fair.

It happens that our Speaker at one time sat in Opposition in this House, and so I feel certain that he knows something about what hon. members in Opposition are up against. I feel quite certain, also, that we of the Opposition need have no fear, and we think your appointment was a proper one.

Mr. Speaker, after the people of the province have voted, I think it is proper, decent and a fair thing to do, that we of the Opposition should extend congratulations to the people who won. Therefore, without spending much time



on that point—I do not think we have to spend much time upon it, as everyone knows pretty well what the outcome was—I wish to say to the hon. Prime Minister that we extend, from over here to over there, our very best wishes.

A funny thing about elections is that after they are over, there are always some people who wish to hold a post-mortem, to find out why the other fellow won, and they did not. Having gone into all these matters, these errors and mistakes, these advertisements in the newspapers, and so on, we come up always with one answer. I know of only one answer: the reason why the other fellow won and somebody else lost is because the other fellow received more votes.

Mr. Speaker, I must hasten to point out that the Party of which I am proudly a part received approximately 585,000 votes, and with those we have formed the Opposition here. Of course, our job is a tremendous one. We understand the work in Opposition is hard, but this Party, even though it is a small Party and we are few, dedicate ourselves to the job, and it is our intent and purpose to do our job in a loyal way.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) in a speech in this House, made some reference to the "Liberals having gone to bed with the Tories." I do not know whether or not these are the exact words he used, but I will try to keep it as clean as it could be. I understand the hon. member said "the Liberals got into bed with the Tories," and thereby beat his man. I wish to say that our Party does not get into bed with anybody. If we were going to get in bed with anybody, I can assure the hon. member for York South that it would not be with him, nor his Party.

The man who represented that great riding in the House, from 1951 to 1955, was a gentleman whom all of us, in all Parties, admired. I am sure that while he sat in the House, his advice and his guidance were appreciated by all Parties

concerned. Our Party had no desire at all to do anything which might injure him or anybody else. It is true we tried to have a candidate run in every riding of the province, and we did everything we could, in a decent and clean manner, in order that we might win. Therefore, I wish to clear up this business as to who is crawling into bed with whom.

We are quite able and willing to fight our own battles as we see them, and we do not expect any help from anybody.

I wish to thank the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) who made mention recently of two former hon. members of the Cabinet of French-Canadian extraction, who came from the county from which I come. He referred to Doctor Octave Reaume, who was a member of the Whitney Ministry, and Doctor Paul Poisson who was a member, I think, of the Henry Ministry.

They were Conservatives, it is true. But they came from a part of the province that is largely made up of French-speaking people. Indeed, the present hon. Minister of Public Welfare is a product of that part of the province and, as we were, and are, proud of those two former members who came from that part, I might say that we are proud also of him.

The hon. Minister was born and raised in the riding which I come from, and he, with other French people from that part of the province have contributed much to good government of the province.

Mr. Speaker, having said something about those who were here and have gone, I wish to link with the names a number of other people who have come from that part of the province as well. In one instance, it is true, the person I wish to mention was never a member of the House here. He is the hon. Paul Martin, who is a member at Ottawa. He is a Minister of the Crown, and he comes from Essex.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Near Pembroke, in the Valley.

MR. REAUME: But Windsor is his home. He had a good start, if I may put it that way. I think we all agree that the hon. Paul Martin is one of the outstanding young men in public life in Canada at the moment.

There is one other person I wish to mention, one who served in the provincial House, and who was also a Minister of the Crown here. He is hon. David Croll, now a Senator at Ottawa.

I think a book probably could be written about "Dave" Croll. Born of immigrant parents, poor yet good, he started off in Windsor by selling newspapers on the streets. After that he became one of Windsor's most outstanding athletes. He was mayor of Windsor for a long time. He was in this House a Minister of the Crown; he then went on to become a Member of Parliament in Ottawa, and now occupies a seat in the Senate. I suppose there are plenty of hon. members of this House at the moment who hope they will "wind up" there some day.

The third person I want to mention is a former Speaker of this House, the late Mr. James Clark. "Jim" Clark, to all those who knew him, was an amiable, lovable sort of person, and I think that he, too, was one man who did much in the way of bringing about good government. He was not of the faith of hon. members opposite, he was a Liberal, and I think that the least that some hon. members opposite can say is that at some time at least, there must have been, down through the history of this province, at least one "Grit" who was some good.

Mr. Speaker, Windsor and Essex County to a large extent is populated by English speaking and French speaking people, of English and French origin. These are the two great peoples who make up the major part of the population of the county. I hope that in giving you a little of the history of Essex I will not prove boring, because it is one of the most interesting parts of the province.

In the early days of Essex, first of all came the Indians. Then, after the Indians came the French, and then the

English. I am a product, not of the Indians, but of the French and English.

The Indians did a good job there, and I just want to say that in the early days of Essex, the English and the French were none too friendly, even in the matter of religion. Because it just so happens that in those early days about half the people were Roman Catholics and the others were Protestants, many of them members of the Orange Lodge.

The reason I mention this is that my father, whose people came from France, was a devout Roman Catholic, and my mother, whose people came from England, was an Anglican, Mr. Speaker, and a member of the Orange Lodge, as was her whole family. Please do not ask me how it ever happened that my father and mother met and finally were married, because the feeling in those early days was bitter. However, I am glad to say that they spent many happy years together and when they died they were buried in keeping with the rites of their own churches.

The point I am trying to bring out is that down through the years there has grown a better feeling of understanding between the English and French speaking people of this country, as also there has grown a better feeling among the Catholics and Protestants, which is exactly as it ought to be. It is my feeling that these two great groups of people, working as a team, will build and mould this country into an even better place than it is at the present time.

Think, for a moment, of the example they have set, and are setting, to the many thousands of people who are coming here from other parts of the world, for very definite and real reasons. First of all they come because Canada is a free country and also because Canada is a young country, and actually presents to its people many, many opportunities. In many instances the people of Europe are sick and tired of living in a state of turmoil. I suppose at this very moment there are millions of people behind the "Iron Curtain" who are hoping and praying that some time in the near future they may come and

join us, and be relieved of their present status of bondage once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, although it is a federal matter, I see no reason for giving any particular nationality a preference in entering Canada. I think that if the people who are coming here want to be good Canadians and make their homes here, we should not be "picky and choosy." Canada was not built for any one class of people, but was built for people who are, to use an hon. member's term, "red-blooded, hairy-chested and free-enterprising" people who want to work and build this country into the kind of place we all hope it will be.

I come from a city which, in my opinion, represents people largely from all parts of the globe. In the City of Windsor and the surrounding area, there are approximately 175,000 people who, in the main, are employed in the automobile plants, people who have earned for that city the title of "The Automotive Capital of the Empire."

We have had troubles in the past and probably will have others. Some people have criticized and found fault with Windsor because periodically a strike occurs there, and because in some instances certain industries have seen fit to move from Windsor. Certain people have placed the blame for that upon the fact that Windsor is highly organized in the way of trade unions.

I should like to say to all parties concerned that the unions of Windsor have nothing to do with the fact that certain industries have moved away from that city. I honestly feel that industry has accepted the fact that unionism is here to stay and, instead of industry working against the unions, industry now has a concern for the interest of all parties involved, and is interested in working with unions of all kinds.

If we consider, for example, the moving of the assembly plant of the great Ford Company from Windsor to Oakville, if we read carefully the statements made at that time by the president of Ford Motor Company, we will find that the real reason for the establishment of the plant in Oakville was that the Ford Company, in their opinion,

thought it better to get closer to the consumer market.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, may I inform the hon. gentlemen that the Ford plant is in the township of Trafalgar, and not in the Town of Oakville.

MR. REAUME: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I have always regarded it as being in Oakville. I stand corrected. I do not think the reason they moved there was that they were not satisfied with the bargaining agent of the union because they have the same bargaining agent where they are now.

Also, if you will examine the announcement made by the president of the company at that time it will be noticed that he said that, while the new plant would be built in Trafalgar Township, they were spending \$34 million—and that is no small sum—on the expansion of their plant at Windsor.

Therefore, in my opinion—and I think that of the people of Windsor—Ford has no idea of "pulling up stakes" in Windsor. Windsor is, properly, the home of the Ford Company.

However, in my opinion, Windsor, when one looks at the map of Canada, is not in such a good location, and it is possible that freight rates had something to do with the fact that certain industries have moved away. Nevertheless, with the coming of the deep waterway, the City of Windsor and the County of Essex will have many inducements to offer the people of the province and of the country, and to any industry which is thinking of coming here.

Some people think, Mr. Speaker, that the deep waterway is still in the talking stage. They do not seem to be able to understand that it is an actuality and, therefore, they are not making any plans for it. I suggest to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle) that he and the experts of his department might lend some assistance to places along the water route, because some of these places at least have not experts available who know how all these things should be planned.

It so happens that the City of Windsor is situated on the south bank of the



busiest river in the world, and so it would appear that proper planning should take place between the City of Windsor and the City of Detroit, which is the automotive capital of the world, and Detroit and Windsor should form a joint commission to plan for the future of their harbour developments. For it is beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, if there is any city or town along the entire deep waterway which is going to benefit—and many of them are—certainly Windsor will be one of them. The future of Windsor is assured. It is now an important place, and in my opinion it will grow more important as the days pass.

Mr. Speaker, some of the labour leaders in the Province of Ontario have advocated a stronger Labour Code. Other leaders of the province have advocated a brand new Labour Code. Others have advocated the scrapping of the entire Act.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Act is basically good. It was passed in 1948, being an outgrowth of the collective-bargaining law of 1943, but the truth of the matter is that both labour and management are displeased with the present functioning of the Act. The conciliation procedure has been proven in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to be an absolute “flop”. It has been most ineffective in the settling of disputes and something should be done about it.

Some may argue that George Burt was wrong in walking out of a board meeting in connection with the recent General Motors strike. We are all entitled to our own views, but I want to ask this question: Why did George Burt walk out? He walked out, Mr. Speaker, simply because he was sick and tired of the procedure, and of the delays, which were enough to frustrate any man. I think he did only what any one else would have done, had they been in his position.

But regardless of what any one may think of George Burt, I think we can put this down in the book, that George Burt is considered one of the finest and most able of labour leaders in the whole

of Canada, and it is recognized that he is doing a good job for his people.

Notwithstanding any statements which have been made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that “all is well”, and that the present Act is “doing a good job”, the fact is that it is not doing even a fair job and, Mr. Speaker, we might just as well face it now, instead of beating around the bush about it.

There is nothing wrong with making changes in laws if it is deemed good for the people of the province. We have experienced long strikes year after year, not only in Windsor and Oshawa, but in other parts of the country, and beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, these long strikes affect, in a big way, the economy of the province and of the whole country. It would appear that the next and proper move is up to every hon. member of this House.

We have set up in this House a labour committee which is about as useful as a fifth wheel on a wagon, for the very simple reason that it does not meet. And yet in this province, which is highly organized and unionized and the home of big industry, this committee could be one of the most outstanding and important committees of the whole House.

What is the trouble, Mr. Speaker? Why is there no action? Well, in my opinion, quite honestly, the hon. Minister has set himself up as a super-labour person, a mediator, one who can settle these strikes all by himself. I have nothing but affection—let us put it that way—for the present hon. Minister of Labour. There is no ill feeling.

HON. MR. DALEY: It does not sound like it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. REAUME: I have not finished, so hon. members do not need to start banging their desks. But I say that I think the hon. Minister is unwilling to accept advice from other people who know as much about this type of work as he himself does.

I think if the government really wants to do something in the interests of establishing more harmony between the unions and management—and I say this in all honesty—then the hon. Prime Minister of the province should insist that this important group—this important committee—should meet forthwith, and keep on meeting until such time as they have heard any and all representations from labour, from industry, and from any other party or parties who might in any way, contribute anything to this important problem.

After such a series of meetings have been held, then the committee could make recommendations either to the hon. Minister of the department, or in the form of a report to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word about something which has been bothering me, and probably bothering every hon. member of the House. I want to speak of The Fair Practices Act, and why I think something should be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have on the Statutes of this province an Act known as The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, and I want to deal briefly with the case of the restaurant owners in the quaint, but good, little Town of Dresden.

As I understand it, the owner of an eating place in Dresden was brought into court for refusing to serve a coloured person. He was brought before the magistrate, convicted, paid a fine, appealed his case to a county court judge, and won the appeal. The county court judge, Judge Grosch, quashed the conviction—is that the word? Anyway, he said “no.”

In any event, here is the point, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make, that the province having this important Act upon its books did not seem to do much about it. I read many statements in the Press, but there is a fact about which I would like some information.

Do not forget, when this Act was passed in this House, the statement was made by the hon. Prime Minister that this was “the greatest piece of anti-discrimination legislation ever passed in

the world.” He took in a large area there, a large area indeed. Yet, when Judge Grosch had finally dealt with this case, as I understand it, there was no appeal, no more action on the part of the province.

Yet only a week ago, in this very House, the hon. Prime Minister properly exclaimed that the government was going to call us back into session for the purpose of passing some legislation respecting The Marketing Act.

The purpose of The Marketing Act, I suppose, is to make the produce grown by man more marketable and more saleable. As I see it, this Act will be drafted and to make certain it is effective it will be referred to the Supreme Court. It will then come back to this House and we will find out whether or not the Act, if and when it is passed by the House, will stand the “acid test” in court.

If the opinion comes back from the court that it will, then I suppose the government of the province will bring it in, and we will pass it.

However, here is the point, Mr. Speaker, which I want to make. This government will go to that extreme—and properly so—in trying to make certain that The Marketing Act will stand the tests in court, when it affects only the produce which is grown by the hands of man, yet here is an Act—The Fair Practices Act—which respects human beings.

MR. MALONEY: The same fellow was convicted yesterday.

MR. REAUME: I know he was, and I know what is going to happen there again.

HON. MR. FROST: The Act and its validity was upheld in the courts yesterday. We think the Act is perfectly sound and well drawn.

MR. REAUME: It will be the same old “rigmarole” of the other action. I have here a clipping from a Toronto paper, reporting, as I understand it, that the very same man has been brought before the magistrate and has

been again convicted and fined. Tell me, is this same man not in the position as he previously found himself?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister). Certainly, why would he not be?

MR. REAUME: Is there any assurance if he appeals to a county court judge—and that is where it will probably go—the same thing will not happen over and over again? If we assume, for a moment, that any county court judge would follow the example of Judge Grosch—

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is the hon. member aware of the introduction by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) of a provision where a further appeal can now be taken from the county court judge to the Supreme Court?

MR. REAUME: I just want to say this, it seems—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I tell the hon. member that I am quite in agreement with what he is trying to say, but over a different route. If this Act is found to be defective or weak, we will strengthen it. I can assure him that will be the case.

We are dealing with the liberties and rights of people and we intend to do it in a proper way.

MR. REAUME: I am happy to hear that, because if the Act does not protect the coloured people or any other group of people—I do not want to mention coloured only—I want to say this Act, and any amendments which might be made to it, was passed in this House, and with that type of Act, or any type of Act which deals with the freedom and rights of human beings, if the thought and purpose of that Act does not come from above, if it does not come from God, and is not instituted as a brotherly gesture, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

I would hope that we shall never in the Province of Ontario—regardless of what government may be in power—

see the day when there will be one law for the rich and one law for the poor, or one law for the whites and one for the coloured people.

I think the sooner we get away from that “stuff” the better.

I was happy to have that assurance from the hon. Prime Minister and I feel much better about it. I want to say I hope the government will not sidetrack this thing. I feel the people of Dresden are interested. I know the feeling there is quite high, and I do not want to stir it up at all, but I think it is well worth watching. If this fellow, McKay, appeals his case to the county court, and if there is not the proper “teeth” in the Act, then I have the assurance that the proper “teeth” will be put in it, and the province will appeal in the event that McKay wins once again. Is that correct?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. REAUME: Another point I want to mention has to do with the gasoline tax only as it affects cars and trucks which are owned and operated by any municipality in the Province of Ontario.

There has been the policy on the part of the government, in my opinion, of making grants with one hand and taking them back with the other. I know, for sure, that in the City of Windsor approximately \$120,000 a year is paid to the province in gasoline taxes, on the gasoline burned in their own trucks, which operate only on its own city streets.

In the instance of a farmer—and I have no hatred for the farmer—he operates his tractor or truck on his own property, and does not have to pay a tax on the gas. Why, then, in the case of any city which operates its trucks only on its own streets, and does not go outside of the city at all, should Windsor, or Toronto, London, Hamilton, Ottawa, Brantford or Oshawa be expected to pay any tax on the gas which they use?

If one of the appropriate men in the Treasury Department, who know some-



thing about this would go into it fully, he will find that in the City of Windsor alone, as I have stated, \$120,000 a year is paid in gasoline tax, so I think this business of paying out in the form of grants with one hand, and taking it away with the other, is wrong.

There has been much said about increasing the old-age pensions. I think it has been mentioned by hon. members of all Parties. I do not think the members of any Party have spoken more about this than have the hon. members on the other side of the House. Apparently the Conservatives—at least the ones I have heard—have spoken in favour of the province granting an increase in old-age pensions. I can say that the reason they have spoken in that manner is because it is the proper, the human, and the decent thing to raise old-age pensions.

There are certain groups of good people in the province, who have spent their own time in going about interviewing old-age pensioners, and invariably they have come up with one answer—that, in effect, the old-age pensioner is living in “a hell upon earth.”

The eyes of the old-age pensioner are upon the hon. members here today—every hon. member of the House. There is no use in trying to “pass the buck” back to Ottawa. Sometimes it is a convenient thing to do, but the fact still remains that there are other provinces which are facing up to the problem, as they ought to, and they have increased the amount the old-age pensioners are receiving in their provinces.

I am hopeful this is a matter which transcends Party lines. All of us are getting along towards the day when we will not simply be talking about the old-age pension, we will be waiting for it. I think before that time arrives, we should start doing something about it. Right now.

If I might say a few more words, there has been some mention made of the highway probe which was held in the province some time ago. I just want to add that I think we might just as well skip that issue, because it is as dead as a frozen fish.

But you know, for a while, there was a new fire started in place of it, which had to do with The Department of Reform Institutions in this province. Every hon. member, I am certain, listened attentively as the so-called “charges” were expounded in this House. We listened also to the answers by the hon. Minister of the Department (Mr. Foote).

First of all, let me say that anyone knowing the present hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, the Christian gentleman that he is, knows full well that he, as head of the department, would not sit by and allow inhuman and brutal treatment to be carried on in the reform institutions of this province. No one could ever make me think or believe that, of all people, he would stand idly by and see a 12-year-old girl abused.

These so-called charges fell flat and they will stay flat, until such time as real evidence is brought forth, and this business of using civil servants as “whipping boys”, must stop.

It is quite a game—quite a pastime. Some people think that civil servants are a type of people upon whom every one can “brush their feet.” Civil servants in every government, in your own home town, here, or in Ottawa, are part of an organization. I do not mean from the standpoint of politics, as some members may think. I mean from the standpoint of the foundation of good government.

Hon. Prime Ministers come and go, hon. Ministers of the Crown come and go, and hon. members of Parliament come and go, but civil servants go on forever. The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar) has already referred to some of these “over-night guests” and just in passing, I wish to say I am very happy that he is looking so well and so happy, and I am sure all hon. members are glad that he is around and we hope he will be for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, the statements produced by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) were simply something that he heard. If he had concrete and absolute evidence, he could have tabled it. If the charges were serious

and true, the House could have instituted a probe. We have had those things before.

If, as it now appears, the hon. member was not certain of his facts, and if he really wished to do good, he could have laid the information before the Minister of the department for action, and if he received no action at the hands of the head of the department, he could have brought the matter before the House.

However, for some reason best known to himself, he worked himself into a terrific frenzy, he disregarded all the rules of common sense, and, instead of doing good by building for a better future, he chose the course so many times chosen by a public man, to do harm and to tear down. That policy is all wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word about the young people of our province. The future of the youth of the province, indeed of the country, is one of the most important problems which face the hon. members of this House. All of us are interested in youth.

We have heard many statements by great men, but the greatest asset we have in the country is our youth. I should think that any man who has an asset, and who thinks anything of it at all, would do everything humanly possible to safeguard and protect it. Yet we read in the newspapers every night that the problem of juvenile delinquency is becoming a more difficult one. We read that in many cities gangs of youths have been formed and that in some cases they have defied constituted authority.

Mr. Speaker, should we, as the people who enact the laws of the province, sit idly by and watch with our own eyes our greatest asset falling apart? I do not mean that all our youth has gone bad. I am sure you will find in Canada the finest young people in the world.

It is important, however, for us to deal with this situation, because a responsibility has been placed upon us in the eyes of man and in the eyes of God to be the keepers of the future of our youth. Indeed, our job is to guide them and to help them in every instance.

In many cities of the United States and in many other places as well, the government has set up departments for youth. There is a department which deals solely with the problems of youth. It has been found in those states that the operation of such a department results in a continuing reduction in the problem of juvenile delinquency, and that it has a great effect in preserving and protecting the youth in those cases.

Mr. Speaker, rather than spend all of our time giving lip service to the fact that all of us are interested in the problems of youth, it might be well if the government of the province were to follow the example set by other parts of the world and do something real toward helping out the young people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late and the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Nickle) has to speak yet. Therefore, I have very little further to say.

I wish to thank the hon. Prime Minister for the fine things he has done, and for the kind things he has said in connection with the dear old school in Windsor, Assumption College, and referred to the Order which operates it as a "highly respected institution." It is conducted by a fine congregation of men. They have won for themselves in Essex, and indeed in the whole of Canada, the title of "Friends of the Boy".

When I say "the boy", I do not mean only the Catholic boy—because it is a Catholic school—I mean all boys. In that institution today you will find, as back in the time I was there, in the years 1920, '21, '22 and '23, a large portion of the students who had come from parents of different faiths. Sitting side by side in the rooms studying were Protestant, Catholic and Jewish boys, whose faces could be either white or black, walking and playing together.

The former Principals of that dear old school have passed on, and now a new day has arrived when Assumption is expanding and blossoming forth. The government of this great province has done well by it, and I would not wish

this hour to pass without having said something in the way of thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am speaking for the people of the great City of Windsor—for all of them, for it makes no different what side of the fence they are on, because they all know the fundamental principles on which that school operates—when I say that we extend to the hon. Prime Minister and the government of the province our most hearty thanks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the duty of closing the debate for the Opposition. I cannot think of anything more to say, and I could not become more angry than I did. I do not want to keep hon. members away from supper, but I do want to make an observation—only in passing, as it has been mentioned before—to this effect; every morning, and sometimes in the early afternoon, the young ladies downstairs who are dressed in red and blue, and looking very sharp, welcome visitors to this building whom the hon. members from all parts of the province have invited, and also the students from various schools. I think it is a grand idea to have them come here. I think the students should come here in large numbers, for the reason that it is always a fine thing for the students to learn the function of government, because there is no better way in which we could help them. But the part which bothers me, and I think should bother all hon. members, is this; what is the use of bringing these children here to learn the functions of government and when they are seated in the “hay lofts”, known as the “galleries”, they cannot hear a word any hon. member is saying.

To show you how bad it is, Mr. Speaker, the man whom I had the honour of defeating in Essex North—and it was indeed an honour—was sitting with me the other afternoon, and we were speaking as two old friends—do not forget this man is a “hide-bound Tory” and when the hon. Prime Minister was speaking, he did not want to miss a word, and I was trying to push him over the rail as far as possible, so he could perhaps hear the hon. Prime Minister. It does not refer only to the

hon. Prime Minister; those in the galleries cannot hear anything that is being said on the floor of the Chamber. So I do hope that something soon will be done about the acoustics in this Chamber.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: May I inform the hon. member for Essex North that the department has called for tenders for a loud-speaking system for this Chamber, which we hope will be in operation at the next session.

MR. REAUME: Today is apparently a good day to get things going. It looks as if we might be getting somewhere.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member for Essex North does not need a loudspeaker, anyway.

MR. REAUME: Oh, I do not know; we are in bad shape, Mr. Provincial-Treasurer.

I want to conclude by mentioning one more matter. I have been receiving letters from people who operate hotels in the province, and there has been an avalanche of complaints and I think it is time something be done about it.

For some reason or other, the government—or whoever employs these people—has built up a large army of inspectors. They have enough inspectors going around inspecting the hotels of this province to almost elect a government. However, that is not the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker. The hotel owners seem to find fault with an inspector coming into a hotel, and finding something wrong, like a door opening one way, when it should open the other, but when the inspector sees anything, he says nothing to nobody; he just sits down and writes out some kind of a report, and does not even give a copy to the owner of the hotel, but mails it to Toronto, and the first thing the hotel owner knows he receives a beautiful note, I presume, from His Honour Judge Robb, which says:

My boy, on such-and-such a day, we expect you to appear before my Board in Toronto.



What for? It does not say. It just says "Come on in".

So, after perhaps travelling 250 miles, the owner calls on His Honour Judge Robb, who says, "Mr. Smith, one of our inspectors was in your establishment on the 15th day of May last, and what did he find? He found you have a door which swings the wrong way."

Mr. Speaker, would it not appear to be just good, common, ordinary, everyday horse sense that if something is found wrong with a door, such as it swinging the wrong way or some other minor thing, that the inspector should be given the right to say to Mr. Smith, "Fix the door." He could inform the hotel keeper what it is all about, rather than sending him all the way to Toronto, and putting him to travelling expenses, and perhaps engaging a lawyer, because when one appears before His Honour Judge Robb, one is in bad shape and greatly worried. Of course, it might create some employment for the lawyers; perhaps they have to look for work, too. But I think it is a foolish thing. I think a simple telephone call to somebody, would result in the matter being straightened out.

I want to mention one other thing, Mr. Speaker, which has been mentioned many times in this House, I think the functions of this House are handled in a dignified way, and I am certain that observers in the galleries understand that hon. members who are sent here by the electors from their own ridings, are only composed of so many pounds of human flesh and blood. I do not think any hon. member in this House has ever felt that all the brains in the province are confined to the heads of the hon. members of this House. We are here for a certain purpose, to do a certain job, and, as hon. members know, before we sit down at our desks and take up our duties, we call upon God to guide and help us, so that we may follow the examples and traditions which have been handed down to us from—as has already been mentioned—the "Mother of Parliaments." I think as long as the government, and a House such as we have here is composed of hon. members

possessing ordinary brains, and who are willing to submit to the will of God, and, knowing their weaknesses, to ask for His help, I think, Mr. Speaker, even though we have a Conservative government, if we all work together, as good people should, it will not make much difference to what Party we belong, and that obstacles which are placed in our way, and which, as I say, appear large, will in time become smaller and smaller, and by all hon. members working together, we can assist to a great measure the building up of this province and this country into the kind of place we think it should be.

HON. MR. NICKLE (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, the first observation I would like to make this afternoon is to extend to you, in a very personal way, my congratulations upon the occasion of your appointment as Speaker of this House. After the general provincial election of 1951, when I first took my seat in this Chamber, you, Mr. Speaker, occupied seat No. 1, and I occupied seat No. 2. At that time, you extended to me many, many courtesies and kindnesses, and today I want to extend to you my thanks for what you did for me when I most needed friends.

After becoming a member of this House my wife and I became friends of Mrs. Downer, a very gracious, outstanding and charming lady, and I am frank to say that as the wife of the Speaker, she will carry on with dignity the great traditions of the wives of Mr. Speakers, who have preceded her.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the addresses in this debate were delivered by the hon. member for South Renfrew, and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, unfortunately I was not here on account of illness in my family, but I would like to inform the hon. members of this House that the hon. member for South Renfrew is a counsel with a great reputation for thoroughness in the preparation of his cases, and the businesslike way with which he meets the problems he has in hand. To me, missing his speech was

my loss. Also, Mr. Speaker, to be deprived of hearing the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie was also a loss, and I would like both the hon. members to understand that it was only for personal family reasons that I could not be present to hear them, and I am looking forward to another opportunity at some future time.

I would like to make the observation that early last fall, Her Royal Highness, the Princess Royal, came to Kingston. Reference was made to her visit by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and on that occasion it was my great pleasure and privilege to extend to Her Royal Highness an affectionate welcome on behalf of the government and the people of the Province of Ontario.

She came to Kingston as the Colonel-in-Chief of the Royal Signal Corps. She inspected this organization, at which time there were on parade men from both the active and the reserve units of this great Corps, and also others who came from across the length and breadth of the Dominion of Canada, and there were representatives from the United States and Great Britain, also present.

A day or so after the visit by Her Royal Highness, a great American visitor came to Kingston, in the person of Mr. Adlai Stevenson, and I said to this great American that a few days before we had the honour of a visit from Her Royal Highness, and I indicated to Mr. Stevenson that if the people of his country—the great United States—and of Great Britain and of Canada, stood shoulder to shoulder against any inroads into their common way of life, and evidenced a respect for the administration of justice and democracy as we understand it, it will be a beacon of hope to those people living in fear and despair behind the Iron Curtain in different parts of the world.

As a result of the visits of these two great people, the Fort Henry Guards were brought to my mind. Last July, the Fort Henry Guards were the guests of the United States Marine Corps in Washington. It was a great event when, on July 1st—Dominion Day—

American and Canadian representatives took part in a common ceremony, and three days later, on July 4th, also took part in a ceremony at the scene of the Iwo Jima memorial.

After our visit, I received a letter from the General commanding the Marine Corps, which I would like to read for the information of the hon. members of this House. It read:

13 JULY, 1955.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

There is being forwarded to you this date, under separate cover, a photograph album containing a collection of photographs taken during the visit of the Fort Henry Guard to Washington, D.C., during the period, 30 June to 5 July, 1955.

This album is presented to you with the compliments of the United States Marine Corps, and I trust will serve as a constant reminder to you of the warm ties of friendship which have been forged between my Corps and the Fort Henry Guard.

With kindest regards, believe me to be

Most sincerely,

LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR. .  
General, U.S. Marine Corps  
Commandant of the Marine Corps

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) who was present on that occasion, I am sure will bear me out when I say that not only were there representatives there of the Fort Henry Guards, and the United States Marine Corps, but also representatives from the Armed Forces of the United States, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force, and representing other nations were the Ambassadors of Great Britain, Australia, Turkey, Panama, Viet Nam, and Haiti. This seemed to me to be well worth-while in this day and generation, when sometimes the matter of a united understanding is being threatened.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make an observation which is rather a personal one. I well recall, in the early days of the session of 1952, my friend,

the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), made the observation that "come October, of this year, if spared, he would live to celebrate thirty-five continuous years as an hon. member of this House". May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in World War I, I had a brother who was a flyer and who was shot down in flames, and never recovered from his wounds. If he had lived, he would, in my opinion, have been an outstanding member of the Bar, and on the occasion of the testimonial dinner given by the hon. Prime Minister and the government of this province to the hon. member for Brant, who also lost a boy in the flying corps, my father and the hon. member for Brant had a common sorrow, and my father wrote a letter to the hon. member for Brant, and for the purpose of the record and for history, I want to read into *Hansard* what my father wrote to the hon. member for Brant. It is addressed to the hon. Harry Nixon, Toronto, Ontario, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR NIXON:

From W. M. I learn that your friends and admirers, of whom there are scores, are rendering you a merited complimentary dinner on the 20th.

Unquestionably, and rightly, there will be words of praise and admiration of your public service and private life.

As I shall not be present, may I take this opportunity of silently recording my appreciation of you.

From your point of view it will be a time of retrospect and thanksgiving—thanksgiving that after a quarter of a century of public life with its vicissitudes, its ups and downs your reputation is untarnished, your character unsullied.

You have the proud satisfaction of having done your duty—complacently and with nice discernment adjusting your views on matters of policy, but firmly never permitting ambition to obscure the worth of principle.

Let me avoid being tedious. May nature be kind granting you many

years of serenity despite the bitter, never to be forgotten blow that fate dealt you.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

(signed) W. F. NICKLE

Mr. Speaker, I heard in this House some observations in connection with war services, and I read in the newspapers certain charges levelled against the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, and I also heard charges levelled against him in this Chamber, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker that on the 19th day of August, 1942—which was the day of Dieppe—the then Captain Foote of the Canadian Army went ashore with those who took part in that great raid. At that time he weighed 210 pounds. He voluntarily walked into a German Prison, as a prisoner of war of the German army, and when he came out he weighed but 140 pounds. He had not been wounded; he could have made the landing craft, but as a result of his actions he was awarded the Victoria Cross, and I want to read the award.

Upon landing on the Beach, he attached himself to the regimental aid post which had been set up in a slight depression on the beach, but which was only sufficient to provide cover for men lying down.

During the subsequent period of approximately 8 hours, while action continued, this officer not only assisted the regimental medical officer in ministering to the wounded in the regimental aid post, but time and again left this shelter to inject morphine, give first aid and carry wounded personnel from the open beach to the regimental aid post. On these occasions, with utter disregard for his personal safety, honorary Captain Foote exposed himself to an inferno of fire and saved many lives by his gallant efforts. During the action, as the tide went out, the regimental aid post was moved to the shelter of a stranded landing craft. Honorary Captain Foote continued tirelessly and cour-



ageously to carry wounded men from the exposed beach to the cover of the landing craft. Also he removed wounded from inside the landing craft when ammunition had been set on fire by enemy shells. When landing craft appeared, he carried wounded from the regimental aid post to the landing craft through heavy fire with no consideration for his own safety. On several occasions this officer had the opportunity to embark but returned to the beach as his chief concern was the care and evacuation of the wounded. He refused a final opportunity to leave the shore, choosing to suffer the fate of the men he had ministered to for over three years. Honorary Captain Foote personally saved many lives by his efforts and his example inspired all around him. Those who observed him state that the calmness of this heroic man as he walked about, collecting the wounded on the fire swept beach will never be forgotten.

It is my desire, Mr. Speaker, with all the sincerity I can command, to say to this honourable Christian, and courageous gentleman, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, that come this June I hope his health will be such that he can go to England, and there meet Her Most Gracious Majesty, Elizabeth II, in order that she may understand the type of man who is the Minister of Reform Institutions for the Province of Ontario.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, there was some question raised concerning a psychiatrist who had assumed unto himself the responsibility of psychoanalyzing an hon. member of this House. He was a member of the civil service, and at the time to which I refer, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) raised the question as to whether a civil servant had the right to express his views.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that during the last general provincial election there appeared in the press in my riding an advertisement inserted by the Liberal Party, in which it was stated that its

platform was that if it went into office, the civil servants in this province would be politically neutral, honest and competent.

Mr. Speaker, from January, 1955, until after the general election, I was the Provincial Secretary of this province, and the civil servants came under my jurisdiction as one of my branches of government and, without any reserve, I want to make this statement, seeing they cannot speak for themselves, apparently, that in my opinion, as our hon. Prime Minister has said on occasion, the civil servants are honest, politically neutral and competent.

I would now like to make an observation, and quote from a book which was written by K. Grant Crawford, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Institute of Local Government at Queen's University, a great authority on municipal law and an alderman on the Kingston City Council. He said:

It is to be expected that there will always be certain difficulties in the relationship between these two levels of government. Only when a society is completely static can we expect to eliminate all inter-governmental friction. The process of growth and evolution is inevitably accompanied by friction and conflict. New problems continuously arise and circumstances change to alter the conditions under which any mutual arrangements may have been worked out. Much can be done, however, to reduce friction, to establish a feeling of mutual confidence, and to permit each level of government to go about its major tasks with greater and more beneficial results, if there is the will to do so.

I quoted that to indicate what a man, highly qualified in regard to municipal affairs, and an alderman in the City Council of Kingston, has to say on this score, and I would like to say to the hon. Prime Minister and to the hon. Minister of Health that on February 17th of this year, Calvin House, a home for nurses at the Kingston General Hospital was opened.

Colonel Stuart M. Polson, and on that occasion, Mr. Arthur Davies, publisher of the *Kingston Whig-Standard*, and chairman of the Finance Committee of the General Hospital, asked me at the very first opportunity to say in this House that the Kingston General Hospital appreciated without any reservation the firm, sincere, continuous financial support this government was giving to the hospitals of the Province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short observation in relation to "brotherhood." It is said that we had "Brotherhood Week" last week. My department at the provincial level of government, deals with immigration and I should like to make this statement, that I, and the members of my department of government, every day of every week of every year practise the principles and policies of Brotherhood Week to indicate and to make known to new Canadians who come to our shore that, having regard to the country from whence they come, to the land of their adoption, there is a warm and sincere welcome.

It is exactly 10 years since the Conservation Authorities Act was set up. In relation to flood control we have done a fair job, but I do say that in relation to the smaller projects which cost less than \$5 million, the Federal Government takes the position it will make no grant in any amount. If it is a project or an Authority concerning a watershed, where the construction is going to cost more than \$5 million, the Federal Government will make a grant of 37½ per cent.

This government wants the smaller Authorities to understand if the Federal Government will not help an under-\$5 million project, then from now on our policy and thinking is going to be, in future it will be, on a 50-50 basis. I think that will make possible a great many more Authorities which will proceed with the work they are presently anxious to do.

Another aspect of my department's activities, is our work on industrial development which play such an impor-

tant part in building up Ontario, and keeping her prosperous. The Province of Ontario is now one of the fastest growing industrial areas in the world. It is also Canada's leading province in respect to manufacturing. Ontario equals all the other provinces combined in this respect and accounts for one-half of all of Canada's employment, payrolls, production and new investment in manufacturing. Manufacturing is Canada's leading employer, paying out salaries and wages which account for nearly one-third of the personal incomes of the people of the province and providing jobs for one-third of those gainfully employed.

As far as the Trade and Industry Branch is concerned, we are doing our level best to secure new industries. We have established an office in Chicago, and from that area we are getting new industries. It is my thinking, and I propose to recommend to the hon. Prime Minister and to my colleagues that an item on this score be included in the Estimates, so there will be sufficient money made available to my department to open an office in New York.

Also I should like to make this point clear, that as far as Ontario House is concerned, they on the British side have given us very top level support.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, immigration is part of my department, and so is trade and industry, and it is very discouraging to sit in this House and hear the leader of the C.C.F. group say in relation to natural gas, that he hopes that project will be a failure. What my department is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to get new industries that are going to absorb some of the immigrants who will be coming to this country in 1956. The Federal Department of Immigration has indicated to me in no uncertain terms that its thinking, as government policy, is that they are going out this year for 150,000 new Canadians. Over 60 per cent. of that number will be absorbed into this province.

Is the hon. leader of the C.C.F. group to be understood to say that, as we

are trying to develop the north country with our new town sites at Manitouwadge, Elliott Lake and Bancroft, that we may need natural gas and have to bring it down to that area, should there be a shortage of Hydro power. That he hoped the pipe line will be a failure? This government is trying to lay the foundation, to give these new people a chance to work, and I say to the hon. member, the leader of the C.C.F. group that the day will come when he will hang his head in shame, as he will be afraid to go to the north country, because there he would see employment and the wheels of industry turning.

We are doing our best to make work available for those who want to work, and yet the leader of the C.C.F. group will have you believe that his feeling and his thinking is to wreck our programme. What is his thinking? Empty bellies, and the bread lines for new Canadians? That, Mr. Speaker, is not my thinking. My thinking is the pay envelope, the pay cheque, happy families, contented people being given an opportunity in this new land.

What in the world is the use of my people in Ontario House doing their level best to assist the federal people to make their quota in relation to immigrants, and to provide a chance to the new people, who wish to take this land as the home of their adoption, if political road blocks are to be put in our way?

HON. G. DUNBAR (Ottawa South): A full dinner pail.

HON. MR. NICKLE: That is right, Mr. Speaker, a full dinner pail. The hon. Minister is quite right.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): And a chicken in every pot.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Mr. Speaker, I am no respecter of a Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. You cannot vote for a Bill one moment, and damn it the next. Take your stand and take your chances, nail your colours to the mast.

I want to put myself on record today, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I think I

know something about the north country. I have been there with the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Mapledoram), the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) and with the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly) on my left, and I am satisfied that the people of that country want those natural resources developed. And what is more, I say that come another general provincial election, the C.C.F. leader, who would wreck the economy of that part of the country, will not be able to go there because he will have to look for cover. A man who will wreck what we are trying to do, has no place in my thinking, when it comes to measuring up to the principles enunciated a few moments ago by the hon. member for Windsor.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit me a moment for a question?

MR. SPEAKER: No questions.

HON. MR. NICKLE: I would like to say something else, if I may. What we want is a man-power inventory, in a three-fold way. We want to take stock of our present man power, assess our future man-power needs, and also see that we have enough people for our national security. Sometimes I think the people are critical in relation to Ontario House, but I want to point out that the Agent-General came over here at my request and met with responsible people from different groups. He has gone back to put his shoulder to the wheel to help the federal level of government in every way he can in connection with immigration. Just as late as this morning I received a letter from the hon. Prime Minister, which he himself had received from the Mayor of Kitchener, Mr. F. L. Dreger, Q.C. This is what he says, addressing his letter to the hon. Prime Minister:

I have just returned from a visit to the Continent, primarily in connection with the Winter Olympics where the Kitchener-Waterloo Dutchmen Ice Hockey Team competed. In addition, I spent a week in England, where, in



co-operation with Ontario House I interviewed several industrialists who proposed to come to Canada.

Throughout my stay in England, your Agent-General, Mr. Armstrong, and his staff of trade counsellors, Stapleford, Thompson and Rooney, were most helpful and kind. I was impressed with the efficient service which they rendered and the keenness with which they approached their jobs.

I would also like to pay tribute to the excellent work of George Taylor on public relations.

In this period of rapidly expanding economy in Ontario, Ontario House and its trade service have an important job to do which, from my recent experience, I would say is being done well.

With kindest personal regards, I would like to remain,

Yours truly,  
(signed) F. L. DREGER,  
Mayor.

That is what the mayor of Kitchener thinks about Ontario House, and I was anxious to read that letter into the record.

May I, at this point, make a passing observation in relation to the Ontario Research Foundation, which is doing so much in trying to make the by-products presently known to industry as waste, into some sort of worth-while asset. I want to pay my respects today to the men and women who are working there, and doing such an excellent job.

It is getting late, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say in relation to Community Planning and Zoning By-laws that we think the suggestions we have made are a worth-while contribution to the municipalities. We do not dictate what a municipality shall do, we are simply a co-ordinating department, trying to help them in any way we can to solve their municipal problems. For instance, in relation to housing, some 39 municipalities have entered into the Land Assembly business. There have been 9,521 houses

built, 200 rental projects and what I call the Dominion-Provincial partnership working it out in the best possible way, for those most concerned, the people who want to buy a lot at cost, upon which they can build their homes after making application to Central Mortgage and Housing for a mortgage, and making the down payment.

May I say a word at this point about civil defence. Men like Sir Winston Churchill, President Eisenhower and Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent, have all made a very firm and strong statement that civil defence is "worth while." This is one of the branches which comes under my department of government and, Mr. Speaker, let me say that, with a view to organizing civil defence to a point of efficiency, we are doing our best. It will be too late to plan for civil defence, when shooting starts. Therefore, may I say to hon. members that I am most anxious to see as far as possible in as many areas throughout the length and breadth of this province, that civil defence committees are established.

I suppose it would not be right, Mr. Speaker, if I did not say a word this afternoon about the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, which is presided over by a gentleman who was a member of this House for a great many years, the hon. George Challies. His headquarters are at Morrisburg, and I have been there to see him. He has his problems. There will be 20 islands created when the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed and 10 of those islands are going to be formed into a scenic parkway.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) made it pretty clear yesterday afternoon, in answer to a statement made by the leader of the C.C.F. group that he did not intend, nor did he want, his party to be hitched to the whiffle tree of the band wagon of "socialism" as preached by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). In that regard, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the other two hon. members in the C.C.F. group have in this House made temperate, broad-minded, fair speeches. Neither of them

has been guilty of any slurs or insinuations. I cannot say as much for the leader of their group. He has cast insinuations against the hon. Prime Minister, and the government, and hon. members of this Legislature, everything to which he can get his tongue, by saying that we are "smooth", "buttery", "slippery" and sometimes I think the best way to psychoanalyze him would be to say that the hon. member for York South seems to secure the information which prompts his political utterances like a hobo gets his tobacco—by picking up from the gutter what others have thrown into it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all hon. members of this House to try to measure up to a great name, that of our hon. Prime Minister. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let them try to measure up, let us all try to measure up to the great name of the hon. Prime Minister, Leslie M. Frost, in character, integrity, and thoughtful human service. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I simply ask this right, to place on the record my view of my leader, and this I would say of him, that he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth fruit in season; his leaf also shall not wither and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, before you put the vote, the leader of our group, the hon. member for York South has asked me to express his regret that he is not able to be here today. He committed himself to an appointment at the University of Western Ontario in London, where he is to speak to some students, therefore, he could not be here.

HON. MR. PORTER (St. George): The hon. member for York South did not want to vote against the government.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Perhaps he realized, Mr. Speaker, that there was no possibility of defeating the government, or, if so, that it was a very remote one, and decided to fulfil his engagement in London.

MR. SPEAKER: The vote will be on the amendment to the amendment. Call in the members.

The amendment to the amendment was negatived on division as follows:

## YEAS

Gisborn  
Gordon  
Innes  
Manley  
Nixon  
Oliver  
Reaume  
Spence  
Thomas (Oshawa)  
Whicher  
Wintermeyer  
Worton

—12

## NAYS

Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk)  
Auld  
Beckett  
Belisle  
Boyer  
Brandon  
Cass  
Cathcart  
Chaput  
Collings  
Connell  
Cowling  
Daley  
Doucett  
Dunbar  
Dunlop  
Dymond  
Edwards  
Elliott  
Fishleigh  
Foote  
Frost  
(Bracondale)  
Frost (Victoria)  
Goodfellow  
Griesinger  
Grossman  
Hall  
Hanna  
Herbert  
Hunt  
Johnston (Parry Sound)  
Johnston (Simcoe Centre)  
Johnston (Carleton)  
Jolley  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kerr  
Lavergne  
Letherby  
Lewis  
Lyons  
Macaulay  
Mackenzie

| NAYS— <i>Continued</i> | YEAS— <i>Continued</i> | NAYS— <i>Continued</i> |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Maloney                | Spence                 | Cass                   |
| Mapledoram             | Thomas (Oshawa)        | Cathcart               |
| Monaghan               | Whicher                | Chaput                 |
| Morin                  | Wintermeyer            | Collings               |
| Morningstar            | Worton                 | Connell                |
| Morrow                 | —12                    | Cowling                |
| Murdoch                |                        | Daley                  |
| Myers                  |                        | Doucett                |
| Nickle                 |                        | Dunbar                 |
| Noden                  |                        | Dunlop                 |
| Parry                  |                        | Dymond                 |
| Patrick                |                        | Edwards                |
| Phillips               |                        | Elliott                |
| Porter                 |                        | Fishleigh              |
| Price                  |                        | Foote                  |
| Pryde                  |                        | Frost                  |
| Rankin                 |                        | (Bracondale)           |
| Robarts                |                        | Frost (Victoria)       |
| Roberts                |                        | Goodfellow             |
| Robson                 |                        | Griesinger             |
| Root                   |                        | Grossman               |
| Sandercock             |                        | Hall                   |
| Scott                  |                        | Hanna                  |
| Spooner                |                        | Herbert                |
| Stewart                |                        | Hunt                   |
| Sutton                 |                        | Johnston (Parry        |
| Thomas (Elgin)         |                        | Sound)                 |
| Villeneuve             |                        | Johnston (Simcoe       |
| Wardrope               |                        | Centre)                |
| Warrender              |                        | Johnston               |
| Whitney                |                        | (Carleton)             |
| Yaremko                |                        | Jolley                 |
| —75                    |                        | Kelly                  |
|                        |                        | Kennedy                |
|                        |                        | Kerr                   |
|                        |                        | Lavergne               |
|                        |                        | Letherby               |
|                        |                        | Lewis                  |
|                        |                        | Lyons                  |
|                        |                        | Macaulay               |
|                        |                        | Mackenzie              |
|                        |                        | Maloney                |
|                        |                        | Mapledoram             |
|                        |                        | Monaghan               |
|                        |                        | Morin                  |
|                        |                        | Morningstar            |
|                        |                        | Morrow                 |
|                        |                        | Murdoch                |
|                        |                        | Myers                  |
|                        |                        | Nickle                 |
|                        |                        | Noden                  |
|                        |                        | Parry                  |
|                        |                        | Patrick                |
|                        |                        | Phillips               |

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

The vote will now be on the amendment to the motion.

HON. MR. FROST: The same vote?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, I presume so.

The amendment to the motion was negatived on division as follows:

| YEAS    | NAYS              |
|---------|-------------------|
| Gisborn | Allan (Haldimand- |
| Gordon  | Norfolk)          |
| Innes   | Auld              |
| Manley  | Beckett           |
| Nixon   | Belisle           |
| Oliver  | Boyer             |
| Reaume  | Brandon           |



NAYS—*Continued*

Porter  
Price  
Pryde  
Rankin  
Robarts  
Roberts  
Robson  
Root  
Sandercock  
Scott  
Spoonier  
Stewart  
Sutton  
Thomas  
(Elgin)  
Villeneuve  
Wardrope  
Warrender  
Whitney  
Yaremko  
—75

YEAS—*Continued*

Fishleigh  
Foote  
Frost  
(Bracondale)  
Frost (Victoria)  
Goodfellow  
Griesinger  
Grossman  
Hall  
Hanna  
Herbert  
Hunt  
Johnston (Parry  
Sound)  
Johnston (Simcoe  
Centre)  
Johnston  
(Carleton)  
Jolley  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kerr  
Lavergne  
Letherby  
Lewis  
Lyons  
Macauley  
Mackenzie  
Maloney  
Mapledoram  
Monaghan  
Morin  
Morningstar  
Morrow  
Murdoch  
Myers  
Nickle  
Noden  
Parry  
Patrick  
Phillips  
Porter  
Price  
Pryde  
Rankin  
Robarts  
Roberts  
Robson  
Root  
Sandercock  
Scott  
Spoonier  
Stewart  
Sutton

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

The vote will now be on the main motion.

HON. MR. FROST: The same vote, in reverse?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.

The motion was agreed to on division, as follows:

## YEAS

Allan (Haldimand-  
Norfolk)  
Auld  
Beckett  
Belisle  
Boyer  
Brandon  
Cass  
Cathcart  
Chaput  
Collings  
Connell  
Cowling  
Daley  
Doucett  
Dunbar  
Dunlop  
Dymond  
Edwards  
Elliott

## NAYS

Gisborn  
Gordon  
Innes  
Manley  
Nixon  
Oliver  
Reaume  
Spence  
Thomas (Oshawa)  
Whicher  
Wintermeyer  
Worton  
—12

YEAS—*Continued*

Thomas (Elgin)

Villeneuve

Wardrope

Warrender

Whitney

Yaremko

—75

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolved that an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

TO THE HONOURABLE LOUIS O.

BREITHAUP, LL.D.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF THE  
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank

Your Honour for the gracious speech  
Your Honour has addressed to us.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the name of Mr. W. B. Lewis, the member for York-Humber, be added to the standing committee on Health.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 5 and 16.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.35 of the clock p.m.



# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Thursday, March 1, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Thursday, March 1, 1956

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Fifth report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....            | 669 |
| Presenting report, Mr. Dunbar .....   | 669 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Porter, agreed to .....         | 669 |
| Budget Address, Mr. Porter .....  | 669 |
| Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wintermeyer, agreed to .....                      | 687 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Frost, agreed to ..... | 688 |
| Mining Act, Bill to amend, reported .....                                       | 688 |
| United Co-operatives of Ontario, Bill respecting, reported .....                | 689 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                                   | 700 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Yaremko, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the committee's fifth report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:

Bill No. 27, An Act respecting The Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 15, An Act respecting Ottawa Community Chests.

Bill No. 20, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill No. 23, An Act respecting the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Synod of Toronto and Kingston.

Bill No. 39, An Act respecting the County of Renfrew.

Your committee would recommend that the following Bill be not reported:

Bill No. 32, An Act respecting the Town of Brampton.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the

actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 23, An Act respecting the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Synod of Toronto and Kingston, and on Bill No. 27, An Act respecting The Beechwood Cemetery Company of the City of Ottawa.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) JOHN YAREMKO,  
*Chairman*

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

MR. H. J. PRICE (St. David): Mr. Speaker, today is March 1, Saint David's Day, the anniversary of the victory of the Welsh people over the Saxons in the year 640. Since I happen to represent the riding bearing that honoured name, I thought I would today bring this matter to the attention of the House.

On another occasion I may adopt the practice of the member who represents the riding bearing the name of another Saint, whose feast day we celebrate later this month, and distribute to the hon. members a leek which is the national emblem of Wales.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the remarks of the hon. member for St. David, being one member of the Legislature born in Wales. Although I am sorry the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Davies) is not in his place today, I am pleased to join with the hon. member for St.

David in paying tribute to the Welsh people on this, their national day, St. David's Day, the feast day of their patron saint.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to secure the national emblem, the leek, this morning in Toronto, but was not successful, and that is the reason why one is not in the lapel of my coat.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

Annual Report of the Department of Highways of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1955.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire to table the answer to Question 23.

Mr. Speaker, I have received two messages from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1957, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Supplementary Estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1956, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

## BUDGET

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with certain aspects of the Budget, I propose to table the Budget Statement, as I do not intend to read the Budget Statement presented as of today in its

entirety. I also propose to table Appendix I, which includes a number of government statements.

I also table the programmes of certain departments: The Department of Highways, The Department of Planning and Development, and The Department of Public Works; and the programme with respect to rural electric power of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the Ontario economy has again demonstrated its capacity to create new job opportunities and to produce an increasing flow of both capital and consumer goods, which have brought with them a rise in real incomes and living standards. A year ago, the level of unemployment had occasioned some disquiet. We were facing increased competition in the sale of our products both at home and abroad from the resurgence of production in Europe and Asia.

The indispensable ingredient of stability—public confidence—was, however, well maintained. Early in the spring, a strong upsurge of demand for natural resource products, especially pulp and paper, lumber, copper and nickel, began to carry the economy swiftly forward. The production of motor vehicles, iron and steel, machinery, electrical apparatus and appliances also moved ahead rapidly. By the middle of the year, it had become clear that we were on our way to new records of production and income.

During 1955, job opportunities were opened for an additional 60,000 workers and, indeed, last December, reflecting the improved conditions for employment, 86,000 more persons were employed than in the corresponding month a year earlier. Unemployment was down 35 per cent. Electrical energy production in Ontario was 21 per cent. higher in 1955 than in the previous year, while another sensitive indicator of economic activity—the value of cheques cashed in clearing centres—was up 10 per cent. General personal incomes were higher. Average weekly wages and salaries in manufacturing reached \$66.48, which is 4 per cent. above those in the preceding year. Increased incomes coupled



with stable consumer prices were translated into higher living standards.

It is particularly gratifying that the past year has been one of more jobs, higher pay and generally improved conditions of employment. Together with the municipalities and the various public commissions and boards, including the Ontario Hydro and the Ontario Northland Railway, we have carried out during the past year the largest capital building and repair programme in our history—a programme requiring capital and repair expenditures of nearly \$700 million, and one that has given employment to an average monthly work force of approximately 175,000 persons in direct on-site and off-site labour.

We undertook that programme not only to meet Ontario's essential public capital needs, but to stimulate employment, which a year ago was causing concern.

Projections of Ontario's public capital needs for the next 10 years indicate a capital expenditure of \$8 billion. That increase covers provincial as well as municipal expenditures. I will give the main items, as follows:

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Hydro-electric and other power facilities ..... | \$1,500 million |
| Schools and universities .....                  | 600 million     |
| Highways and roads .....                        | 3,000 million   |
| Water and sewage .....                          | 1,500 million   |
| Hospitals and other Provincial buildings .....  | 425 million     |
| Other .....                                     | 975 million     |

I now give a summary of expenditure and revenue for 1955-56, the year just ending.

The government's net ordinary expenditure in the current fiscal year ending March 31, 1956, is estimated at \$410,593,000. This includes the various special grants and payments which are described in detail in the next sections as well as provision for sinking funds of \$17,630,000. The net ordinary revenue of the government is estimated at \$411,342,000, giving us an interim surplus on ordinary account of \$749,000 after providing \$28.5 million for Highway Reserve Account and \$17.6 million for sinking fund. Both these funds aid in keeping our credit position strong.

This is the government's thirteenth consecutive surplus.

I am glad to be able to inform the House that we have reached the end of the year in a revenue position which again enables us to provide special assistance to the universities and the hospitals, whose needs, I am confident you will agree, are exceptionally pressing. The Teachers' and Public Service Superannuation Funds will be strengthened, as they have been in the past few years, by special contributions. There will also be grants for certain other special purposes and all these will be paid out of Supplementary Estimates, out of this year's revenues, which will be laid before the House.

As pointed out in the province's submission to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects, the universities are confronted with an immense programme of expansion. For the past 4 years, we have given tangible recognition to university requirements by making special capital grants available to them. Before the end of this fiscal year, we propose to pay the universities for new construction and other capital purposes, special grants of \$7.2 million. This is an increase of \$1.6 million over the capital grants made available last year. I intend to go into that in greater detail in a few moments.

The payment of this amount will bring \$19.9 million the capital grants made available to the universities in the last 5 years. With the provision of an additional \$1.0 million to the University of Toronto for the College of Dentistry, \$3.0 million has now been provided for this purpose. The nationwide shortage of dentists has become increasingly acute and it is imperative that steps be taken to bring additional facilities into operation. It has been our hope that, with the announcement of our plans to provide for a new dental college, the Federal Government, because of the national service performed by the College of Dentistry in Ontario, would make a substantial contribution to this important project. So far, the Federal Government has not come in, but it is our hope that it will.

In addition to the grants to the universities, it is our intention to pay special grants totalling \$150,000 for the provision of facilities needed for the education of retarded children.

At a cost of \$5.5 million, special grants will again be paid to the public general hospitals at a rate of \$200 per bed for rehabilitation and other capital purposes. An indication of the benefits that will be received by the hospitals is shown in the following table, while more complete details are shown in the appendix on government statements.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Barrie, Royal Victoria Hospital .....                | \$ 26,800 |
| Chatham, St. Joseph's Hospital .....                 | 23,800    |
| Fort Frances, LaVerendrye Hospital .....             | 20,000    |
| Galt, South Waterloo Memorial Hospital .....         | 43,200    |
| Hamilton, Hamilton General Hospital .....            | 268,200   |
| Hamilton, St. Joseph's Hospital .....                | 95,800    |
| Kingston, Kingston General Hospital .....            | 94,000    |
| Kingston, Hotel Dieu .....                           | 57,600    |
| London, St. Joseph's Hospital .....                  | 86,000    |
| London, Victoria Hospital .....                      | 155,400   |
| St. Catharines, Hotel Dieu .....                     | 27,000    |
| St. Catharines, St. Catharines General Hospital .... | 73,400    |
| Sudbury, Sudbury General Hospital .....              | 61,400    |
| Toronto, Toronto General Hospital .....              | 278,600   |
| Toronto, Toronto Western Hospital .....              | 139,400   |
| Toronto, Sick Children's Hospital ..                 | 152,400   |

To provide grants for additional public general hospital beds constructed in the present fiscal year over and above the original Estimates, authority will be requested for a supplementary payment of \$750,000.

With the payment again this year of a special grant of \$1.0 million to the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the province will have made available a total of \$8.3 million for the construction and equipment of the Institute of Radiotherapy in Toronto. This project is progressing well and, when completed in the autumn of this year, will be one of the most modern research and treatment centres of its kind anywhere in the world.

It is proposed to pay a special grant of \$300,000 to the Toronto East General Hospital—a teaching hospital that serves many parts of the province and is now undertaking a major expansion of its facilities.

Last year, we provided a special grant of \$100,000 to the Ontario Heart Foundation to enable it to accelerate its work in the field of heart disease, which accounts for over 35 per cent. of all the deaths in the province. It is our intention to again provide a special grant of \$100,000 for this purpose.

A grant of \$100,000 will also be made to the Stratford Shakespearean Festival of Canada Foundation as a contribution to its building programme. The Shakespearean Festival has many notable achievements to its credit and has increased this country's prestige abroad in no uncertain way, and this grant will assist it in becoming a permanent part of Ontario's cultural life.

A special grant of \$1.0 million towards a new building will also be made to the Royal Winter Fair in recognition of the widespread benefits which are derived from its annual exhibition and the work it carries on.

In addition, grants of \$100,000 each are to be extended to the Royal Botanical Gardens, Hamilton, and to the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto for the development of zoological gardens. I believe they are asking for power to carry that out in their Bill, to give them support. The Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals will benefit to the extent of \$10,000.

The polio vaccine campaign carried out last year was such a conspicuous success that this year its coverage will be extended. Orders have already been placed for the vaccine, and it is proposed to provide for the payment—by way of a Supplementary Estimate—of \$955,000.

In order to strengthen the financial position of the Teachers' Superannuation Fund and the Public Service Superannuation Fund, a special payment of \$1.0 million is being made to each of these funds.

All told, the special grants and payments to be authorized by Supplementary Estimates and paid before the end of this fiscal year amount to \$19.3 million. In addition, \$28.5 million will

be transferred to the Highway Reserve Account by Supplementary Estimate.

Celebrations to mark the creation of the Victoria Cross 100 years ago will be held in London, England, this June. To honour those residents of the Province of Ontario who have won this coveted award, the government proposes to make a special grant totalling \$5,000 to those among these gallant men who will be making the Centenary pilgrimage this June and to certain of their relatives who choose to make the journey. A provision of \$5,000 is made, but we do not know yet there will be; however, that is an item which I can assure the hon. members of this House if necessary will be supplemented. I may say the grant will be \$500 for each holder of the Victoria Cross or any person who goes in his stead who resides in Ontario. Also, \$200 will be provided if he takes with him any of his dependents or his wife. This, I may say, is done as a contribution towards the travelling expenses over and above the travelling costs which are being supplied by the Federal Government. The proposed grant, for which provision will be made in next year's Estimates, has been specifically designated to assist in defraying the expenses of these people during their stay in London: qualifying for it, besides holders of the Victoria Cross making the journey, will be any accompanying relative in the person of wife, father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter or grandchild; or, where the holder of the Victoria Cross is now deceased, a mother, widow, or other near relative. It is surely most fitting that we should recognize, and pay tribute to, the heroism of these men in this manner.

I now will present a forecast of revenue and expenditures for 1956-1957. For the coming fiscal year ending March 31, 1957, I am estimating the province's net ordinary expenditure at \$419,751,000 and its net ordinary revenue at \$420,519,000. Accordingly, I am budgeting for a surplus on ordinary account of \$768,000, after provision of \$17,729,000 for sinking funds. This

will be our fourteenth consecutive surplus.

The more important items in the government's net ordinary expenditure are: Education, \$108 million, which includes grants paid to schools and universities, and costs of operating The Department of Education; Highways, \$88.2 million; Health, \$57.3 million; Public Welfare, \$31.3 million; and Municipal Affairs, \$16.8 million. The major sources of net ordinary revenue are: the tax rental payment, \$151.7 million; gasoline tax, \$100.0 million; Liquor Control Board profits, \$45.0 million; and motor vehicle licences and permits, \$41.0 million.

Turning to capital payments, we estimate that our expenditure on physical assets will amount to an all-time high of \$173.8 million, an increase of 34 per cent. over our estimated expenditure for the current fiscal year. Of this amount, \$114.6 million (including \$37.0 million from Highway Reserve Account) or 66 per cent., is allocated for King's highways, development roads, municipal roads, and mining and logging access roads; \$43.8 million for public buildings and other public works; \$9.2 million for Ontario Hydro's rural electrification programme; and \$6.2 million for the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, grants to Conservation Authorities, community planning and miscellaneous projects.

In meeting these huge demands, we have endeavoured to steer a course which would neither oblige us to make extensive use of our credit, nor resort to increased rates of taxation.

During the past 13 years we have invested in highways, public buildings, conservation projects, hospitals and rural power extensions a total of \$659 million. The entire amount could not be financed out of our current revenues under our present structure of taxation, but it is very gratifying that over two-thirds of that investment has been financed from current revenues by way of sinking fund instalments, surpluses on ordinary account and special provisions.



On March 31, 1955, our net capital debt was \$661 million, approximately \$161 million higher than on March 31, 1943. In per capita terms, however, the debt showed an increase of only 29 cents from \$127.76 to \$128.05 and, of course, the real burden of the debt has been considerably reduced by the rise in incomes and revenues.

Despite the large capital projects undertaken this year, the province was obliged to enter the money market on only one occasion. In July, it sold at par a \$50 million issue of 3 per cent. 10-year bonds, maturing September 1, 1965. The terms of this issue were especially favourable to this province. As the year progressed, the general trend of interest rates moved sharply upward. Measures which heretofore had been adopted to assure adequate credit for business expansion were reversed, to restrict credit and so prevent the prevailing buoyant business conditions from generating inflationary effects. The Bank of Canada, in 3 successive adjustments raised the bank rate from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in August to  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. in November. The rise of interest rates in Canada and the Bank of Canada's action were in response to world conditions and followed the pattern of development in both the United States and Great Britain. During recent weeks, there has been a very slight easing in some interest rates.

Apart from the province's own issue in July, we guaranteed an issue of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario of \$65 million payable in two terms: \$50 million, with a maturity of 20 years and yielding 4.00 per cent., and \$15 million, maturing in 10 years and yielding 3.84 per cent. With these issues, the total amount of financing, during the past 13 years, for which the province has either issued its own bonds or guaranteed Ontario Hydro bonds has risen to \$1,931 million. Of this amount, \$1,646 million, or more than 85 per cent., has been raised in Canada. Over 66 per cent. of this borrowing—\$1,260 million—was required by Ontario Hydro to finance its capital expansion.

I am glad to be able to inform the House that there will be no new taxes and no increase in taxes during the next fiscal year. There will be certain minor changes, mainly of an administrative nature. The race tracks' tax on pari-mutuels, effective April 1, will be 6 per cent. To facilitate administration and to minimize the inconvenience to manufacturers, The Gasoline Tax Act will be amended so that the tax on aviation fuel, paint solvents and naphthas, which at present is refundable on the application by the taxpayer, will in future not be collected and therefore no refund claim will be required.

A new Fuel Tax Act will be introduced to place the taxation of diesel fuel used in motor vehicles under a separate Act. At present, diesel fuel is taxed under The Gasoline Tax Act. The purpose of placing the diesel fuel tax under a separate Statute is to improve the administration of the tax.

I am sure that it has been apparent for some time to everyone that we could not continue to finance the enormously increased expenditure for highways and municipal road subsidies without some upward adjustment of motor vehicle licences. This explains the announcement last December providing for an increase in the motor vehicle registration fees as from January 1, 1956.

Although we have done exceedingly well in meeting the service needs of our expanding economy while keeping our tax structure within moderate limits, there is no denying that pressures on our revenues are developing. We have been called upon to embark upon an enormously expanded programme of highways, hospitals and other public buildings and works, and at the same time to provide a 9-fold increase in our assistance to municipalities and school boards in the last dozen years. The time is rapidly approaching when further increases in expenditures cannot be accommodated within the dimensions of our present revenue.

We will, therefore, be obliged either to halt expenditure increases or obtain new sources of revenue. The situation calls for the most careful husbanding of

our revenues and the exercise of the utmost economy in expenditures. This must be the policy not only of the province but of the municipalities and local school boards. Our requirements are so large that we must concentrate on essentials, and leave to the future the things that we would like to do but cannot for the time being afford.

If a more realistic attitude on the part of the Federal Government towards the tax arrangements which are being proposed is forthcoming, then our situation might be very much relieved.

I wish to remind this House of the conclusion of the Budget speech last year. The then hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), best known to the hon. members of this House as the hon. member for Victoria, said:

I believe we are now on the threshold of great things in our country and in our province. We have increased our living standards by 30 per cent. in the last 12 years. As I have said we have strengthened personal and family security. There is no reason why we should not, in the next dozen years, surpass these achievements.

If we are to do so, I think we should observe 4 rules. First, we must exercise good common sense and recognize if we want more public services, we must be prepared to pay for them.

Secondly, we must maintain public confidence in our securities and keep our credit standing bright and clean.

Thirdly, we should keep our taxes as low as possible, and

Fourthly, we must undertake the great development work which will increase the efficiency and productivity of our workers and our industry.

If we follow this course, we can achieve higher living standards and make the fruits of our province available in an ever-widening circle.

In serving Ontario, we have adopted policies that promote development and

raise productive efficiency and living standards. The importance of these services in the Ontario Budget is shown in the 5-fold increase in our combined expenditures on education, health and welfare from \$39 million in 1943-44 to an estimated \$189 million for the present fiscal year. The provision for next year will require an increase of \$25.0 million over the amount voted last year.

Education continues to pose one of our most pressing problems. It was about a decade ago that our elementary and secondary school attendance was only 660,000, now it is 1,050,000. Each year, facilities and teachers must be provided for nearly 70,000 additional pupils. Nor is the end in sight.

During the fiscal year, we have provided local school boards with \$70.8 million, plus \$3.4 million which was charged to 1954-55 accounts, but was paid out during the 1955 school year in the form of a special grant of \$4 per pupil. For the next fiscal year, 1956-57, a very large increase is provided under the regular school grants formula, and, in addition, we are again paying a special per pupil grant which has been raised to \$6; based on average daily attendance, this will cost \$5.8 million. The combined provision for schools in the coming year amounts to \$84.0 million. This is one of the largest increases in school grants ever made, and brings the total increase in the last 3 years to \$25 million, or 42 per cent.

This Budget also makes available a very substantial increase in assistance to the universities. Present university enrolment is now nearly 21,000, and applications for admission are expected to double over the next decade. In recognition of their needs, maintenance grants to universities and colleges were increased from \$2.5 million in 1945-46 to \$7.3 million in the current fiscal year, and provision is being made for a further increase of \$930,000 in the coming fiscal year, 1956-57.

Apart from this assistance, the government in the past 4 years has provided over \$12 million in the form of capital grants for building expansion, and Sup-

plementary Estimates will be introduced at this session, providing for additional capital grants totalling \$7.2 million.

In addition to the universities and colleges to which I have referred, we are giving practical consideration to the needs of the agricultural colleges operated directly by the province. To provide the funds for the erection of new science facilities, including a new soils building at the Ontario Agricultural College, the extension of veterinary science at the Ontario Veterinary College and certain other purposes, we are including in the coming fiscal year's

Estimates capital grants totalling \$4.1 million, some \$3.5 million more than was expended for these purposes last year.

As their maintenance appropriation will also be increased by \$441,500, we are thus providing a total of \$4.0 million additional money for agricultural education. With these appropriations, maintenance expenditures are being increased by 10 per cent. over those last year and capital expenditures by more than 600 per cent.

Details of all these grants are shown in the following table:

PROVINCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYABLE TO UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES  
IN CALENDAR YEAR 1956

|   | Maintenance<br>Grants | Special<br>Grants for<br>Capital<br>Purposes | Total     | Increase in Maintenance and Special<br>Capital Grants in 1956 over 1955 |                      |                    |
|---|-----------------------|--|-----------|---|----------------------|--------------------|
|   | (\$000's)             | (\$000's)                                    | (\$000's) | Maintenance<br>(\$000's)  | Capital<br>(\$000's) | Total<br>(\$000's) |
| University of Toronto .....   | 5,200                 | 1,915  | 7,115     | 500   | 115                  | 615                |
| University of Toronto<br>for extension of facilities at the<br>Faculty of Dentistry ..... |                       | 1,000  | 1,000     |   |                      |                    |
| for Ontario College of<br>Education .....   | 490                   |  | 490       |   |                      |                    |
| Queen's University .....  | 775                   | 1,000  | 1,775     | 100   | 400                  | 500                |
| University of Western Ontario ..  | 775                   | 1,000  | 1,775     | 100   | 400                  | 500                |
| McMaster University<br>(Hamilton College) .....   | 275                   | 600  | 875       | 50  | 300                  | 350                |
| University of Ottawa<br>for the Faculty of Medicine<br>and Science .....                  | 275                   | 600  | 875       | 50  | 300                  | 350                |
| Carleton College .....  | 175                   | 1,000  | 1,175     | 30  | 800                  | 830                |
| Assumption University<br>for Essex College .....  | 100                   | 500  | 600       | 100   | 300                  | 400                |
| Ontario College of Art .....  | 150                   | 125  | 275       |   | -475                 | -475               |
|   | 8,215                 | 7,740  | 15,955    | 930   | 2,140                | 3,070              |

FISCAL YEAR 1956-57

| Agricultural Colleges   | Gross<br>Maintenance<br>Charges | Capital<br>Outlays | Total     | Increase in Gross Maintenance and<br>Capital Outlays—1956-57<br>over 1955-56 |                      |                    |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--|----------------------|--------------------|
|   | (\$000's)                       | (\$000's)          | (\$000's) | Maintenance<br>(\$000's)   | Capital<br>(\$000's) | Total<br>(\$000's) |
| Ontario Agricultural College and<br>MacDonald Institute ..... | 3,643                           | 2,686              | 6,329     | 327  | 2,226                | 2,553              |
| Ontario Veterinary College .....                              | 952                             | 1,385              | 2,337     | 87   | 1,317                | 1,404              |
| Kemptville Agricultural School ..                             | 323                             | 38                 | 361       | 28   | 2                    | 30                 |
|   | 4,918                           | 4,109              | 9,027     | 442  | 3,545                | 3,987              |
| GRAND TOTAL .....   | 13,133                          | 11,849             | 24,982    | 1,372  | 5,685                | 7,057              |



With this as our objective, the chief director of education of the province has been appointed to act in a co-ordinating and advisory capacity in respect to the long-range plans that will be required to provide the universities with facilities and staff to accommodate the impending flood of applicants. The responsibility for initiating plans will, of course, rest with the universities themselves. They have the judgment, the experience and the self-interest to bring into effect, in co-operation with the province an integrated programme tailored to meet our future requirements.

The government has not been unmindful of the needs of our less fortunate children. Thirty-five classes for retarded children, with an enrolment of over 800 pupils, have now been established. These classes are in operation from Niagara Falls to Timmins, from Kingston to Windsor and from North Bay to the Head of the Lakes. Grants of \$250 per pupil of average daily attendance are paid to parents' groups for the conduct of these classes, while special training is offered to the teachers in summer sessions.

With this ever-widening demand for educational services, the province's educational bill, exclusive of that for the agricultural colleges in 1956-57 will be \$108.0 million, by far the highest in its history. If the expenditures on agricultural colleges be included, it will be \$117 million. This is equivalent to 28 per cent. of our estimated revenue next year and to our total ordinary expenditures on all services a dozen years ago.

The past year will be recorded as one of the most notable in the field of health in a long time. Not only has Ontario's health programme been carried forward with unrelenting vigour, but more progress has been made towards the establishment of a plan of national hospital insurance than in all the previous years that this subject has been under consideration.

Thus, in view of the magnitude of the expenditures involved, the utmost care must be exercised to insure that costs are kept within the financial capacities of our people and an efficient and

equitable method of financing is devised. The Hospital Services Commission, being established at this session, will lay a sound foundation for the development of hospital services.

The painstaking consideration that has been given to hospital insurance over the past year has not distracted us from proceeding diligently with our general health programme. Before the end of this year, we will pay out special capital grants totalling \$8.6 million for hospitals and other health purposes. The appropriation for the coming fiscal year, 1956-57, is \$57.3 million, so that the total amount to be voted for health at this session is \$65.9 million, or \$5.0 million more than last year.

Assistance to the public general hospitals, including maintenance construction and rehabilitation grants, will total \$21.4 million in the present fiscal year.

One of the most heartening developments in the field of health is the reduction in the mortality rate of tuberculosis, which now requires a provincial expenditure of over \$6.0 million. With respect to other items on the programme of public health, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will no doubt make a full statement.

Our polio vaccine programme will be extended in 1956. In 1955, two doses of Salk vaccine were given in 842 municipalities to more than 350,000 children from the first 3 grades of the elementary schools. For 1956, the government has ordered 3,375,000 doses. This will provide a third dose to all last year's group and first and second doses to all other elementary school children and to some children of pre-school age.

It is hoped that the province can give two doses of the vaccine this year to the new Grade 1, to Grades 5, 6, 7 and 8, and to as many children as possible between the ages of 2 and 5 years. If sufficient vaccine is available, a third dose will be given to these children as well.

Work on the Ontario Cancer Institute is proceeding on schedule and the prospects are that the building will be

completed by the fall of 1956. The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, set up by this government, is proceeding with an efficiently planned programme. Our share of the cost this year is estimated to be \$1,050,000, as compared with \$550,000 a year ago.

In co-operation with pathologists throughout the province, the Cancer Foundation offers a free biopsy service to cancer patients or to persons suspected of having cancer, distributes scholarships for special study in this field and provides special equipment for modern treatment. By these means, it is hoped that cancer will be detected earlier and its effects mitigated.

Disability allowances, pioneered in this province, have continued to fill an essential area of need in our social welfare programme. The cost of these allowances in the current fiscal year is \$1.7 million and it is expected that next year it will rise to \$2 million. I need not go into further detail with respect to that because the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) will give a full statement with his Estimates.

Ontario's allowances to mothers and their dependents are the most generous in Canada. Under the provisions of The Indian Services Welfare Act passed last year, mothers' allowances benefits were extended to Indian mothers with dependent children on the same basis as to all other groups.

Child welfare has been, and continues to form, an important part of our activities. The province provides substantial financial and supervisory aid in support of day nurseries. At present, it meets 50 per cent. of the cost of 27 day nurseries operated by the municipalities.

During the past year, the Provincial Government worked out the details of an agreement with the Federal Government to extend all child welfare services to Indian children and families. This will implement one of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Native Indians.

There are few more welcome signs of rising living standards than the increase in housing. Except for certain temporary setbacks over which we have had no control, each year has brought with it a new record of residential completions. The rate of increase has been especially marked since 1953, during which time Ontario has written 3 consecutive records in units completed, and construction in 1956 may pass them all. The 52,000 housing units completed in 1955 was 11,000 greater than in 1954, and 17,000 more than in 1953. The 1955 total was 3 times greater than the number of completions in 1945. In all, nearly 350,000 new and converted residential units have been constructed in Ontario since 1945.

To the end of the current fiscal year, both land assembly and rental housing schemes will have involved federal and provincial commitments of over \$40 million.

The soundness of the Second Mortgage Plan carried out by the Government of Ontario between 1948 and 1950 is confirmed by each succeeding year. Although provisions of The National Housing Act superseded the programme under The Ontario Act, 14,695 loans were made under the provincial plan, 5,597 of which were fully repaid by January 31, 1956. Of a total advance of \$16.6 million in Ontario Second Mortgage Loans, \$9.8 million in principal had by that date been repaid.

For the fiscal year 1956-57, \$8 million will be provided in the Estimates for the several federal-provincial land assembly and rental housing schemes going forward.

Very substantial progress has been made this year towards evolving an effective province-wide public parks policy. Under legislation to be approved at this session, a new parks board will be established, permitting a uniform policy to be adopted for all parks at present under the control of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Parks Commissions and the Parks Division of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Revenues from water rentals will be used not only to support the development of existing parks, but also to acquire new parks, with a view to promoting an optimum distribution of parks through out the province in accordance with need. Temporarily, \$1.5 million will be advanced to the St. Lawrence Parks Commission for capital purposes.

The total value of production from Ontario's primary industries—agriculture, forestry and mining—again increased in 1955, principally as a result of expanded production and higher prices in forestry and mining. After substantial declines in 1952 and 1953, farm cash income has been fairly stable over the last two years. A very slight reduction in 1954 was offset by an increase of about 2 per cent. in 1955.

The decline in farm income has occurred not from the lack of productive capacity but as a consequence of the decline in the prices of agricultural products and other factors beyond our control. The problem has been aggravated by the rise in farm operating costs and the fact that the majority of Ontario's practicing farmers have commenced operations since the end of World War II.

Two factors, however, have recently been more encouraging for farming: first, the downward trend in farm prices was arrested early last year, and second, the growing local market should bring about an increase in effective demand and in time produce more favourable conditions. Population growth of the order of 140,000 a year has been projected, indicating an Ontario market of 6½ million by 1965.

In general, while agriculture in Ontario is going through a period of readjustment, both mining and forest-based industries have enjoyed exceptional prosperity. The value of output in Ontario's mining industry in 1955 reached the unprecedented level of \$578 million—more than 16 per cent. higher than that in 1954. Similarly, 1955 was for Ontario's forest industries a year of greater activity.

The problems of farming are being given careful consideration. Steps are being taken to strengthen the farm products marketing programme, educational and research facilities, extension services, electric power, rural telephone services and junior farmer loan policy.

Such is the magnitude of the agricultural marketing programme in Ontario that there are now 3 times as many farm marketing schemes in operation in this province as in all the other provinces combined. The programme embraces 18 marketing plans covering some 30 crops—to which should be added the more than 50 community auction markets and, also, the two annual livestock auctions which have gained international recognition.

A permanent market board was established last September and staffed by 3 qualified, full-time officials. With a view to clarifying the Constitutional jurisdiction of farm marketing legislation, the province, in a wide reference, is submitting the question to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Technology and agricultural science continued to play an important role on the farm. Indeed, the spread of mechanization, the steady advance of electrification, and the adoption of better farming practices in general, have combined to raise farm productivity significantly during the last decade and a half. Output per agricultural worker in Ontario is now about 75 per cent. greater than it was 15 years ago. The strides made in farm electrification during the past decade have been most striking. The number of farm services supplied by Ontario Hydro increased from under 60,000 in 1944 to almost 139,000 in 1955. The average annual consumption of electricity per farm service supplied by the commission grew in the same period from under 2,000 kilowatt hours to close to 4,200 kilowatt hours.

The province's agricultural research programme will be strengthened and the provision of technical and scientific advice to farmers aided by the addition of new scientific and research facilities.



Plans have been completed for the erection of a new soils building at the Ontario Agricultural College; this should go far towards meeting the heavy demands of farmers for soil analysis.

The present enlargement of the Ontario Veterinary College's laboratory facilities will be of considerable value to the province's livestock industry, while of importance to the horticultural industry will be the expanded research and extension services of the Vineland Experimental Station.

During the past year, as in previous years, the government helped communities equip themselves with amenities such as community halls, arenas, skating rinks, swimming pools and athletic fields. Thus, in 1955-56, 81 community projects—comprising 24 halls, 8 arenas, 6 combination hall-arenas, 28 athletic fields, 10 outdoor rinks and 5 swimming pools—received grants. Altogether, over \$2.1 million has been made available by the province for 945 such projects.

Progress is being made in improving telephone services in rural areas. As part of its policy of facilitation consolidations and establishing more efficient services, the Ontario Telephone Authority in 1955 participated in negotiations for the sale or disposal of 45 telephone systems. The authority has also been assisting rural telephone services by furnishing the companies with engineering advice and operating plans.

One of the government's services to agriculture which is proving of considerable value to the province's farm youth is the Junior Farmers Loan programme. Set up under The Junior Farmer Establishment Act of 1952, and designed to assist those young farmers who wish to establish themselves on farms of their own, the Junior Farmer Establishment Loan Corporation has approved 1,569 loans totalling almost \$10.3 million.

During the year 1955-56, 460 applications for loans totalling over \$3.2 million were approved by the corporation. This year, it is proposed to increase the maximum amount which may

be outstanding at any one time under the Act from \$10 million to \$20 million.

To carry on the government's agricultural services, the appropriation on Ordinary Account is being increased from the \$9.7 million voted last year to \$10.8 million for the coming fiscal year.

I shall not dwell in particular with the mining industry. The hon. Minister has shown great confidence in its future, and hon. members now have the full particulars of the prospects, and perhaps which are the good stocks to buy, and the bad stocks.

In regard to forestry: the management of Ontario's timber resources on a sustained yield basis is now to be strengthened by a more intensive policy of regeneration. Considerable sums are already being spent for this purpose, and, in the coming fiscal year, it is proposed, in addition, to allocate the amount of \$550,000 for regeneration work in our red and white pine, spruce, jack-pine and birch forests. It is intended to allocate close to \$6 million for the 1956-57 fiscal year.

Last year was unusual on account of the number of forest fires, and it is hoped they will not be repeated next year. The total appropriation for The Department of Lands and Forests for the coming year on Ordinary Account will be \$15.4 million, an increase of \$1.9 million over the vote last year.

In respect to "Conservation": the creation of a Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority is now in progress. The new authority will give the Metropolitan corporation necessary recognition in the conservation matters affecting that important area, covered by the Etobicoke-Mimico Conservation Authority, the Don Valley Conservation Authority, the Humber Valley Conservation Authority and the Rouge River, Dufferin, Highland and Petticoat Creeks Conservation Authority, all of which will be brought within the planning orbit of the Metropolitan Authority. The advantages of an overall planning organization in this densely populated region will be apparent.

In all, there are 19 conservation authorities at work in the province, comprising a total membership of 287 municipalities with a combined area of 12,021 square miles. To date 36 surveys, covering watersheds as a whole or in part, have been made as a part of the Conservation Authorities' programmes.

During the fiscal year 1955-56, a grant of \$1,250,000 was made to commence the Conestogo Dam on the Grand River—\$5.4 million will be the approximate total investment. With the completion of this project and others now under way, the investment in such works in Ontario will total nearly \$15 million.

Reforestation is another project undertaken by the conservation authorities, and 12 of these have signed agreements with The Department of Lands and Forests for the management of such areas. The total acreage of reforestation lands acquired to date is 28,633 and the assistance to private reforestation has also been increased. During the current fiscal year, the total expenditure of all departments on conservation was over \$21 million. For next year, \$24 million is being placed in the departmental Estimates for this purpose.

I shall not dwell upon the proposal which is contained in the Bill, which was passed recently in this House dealing with the problems of water works and sewage. It has been fully dealt with by the hon. Prime Minister in his statement made in connection with that Bill.

Neither shall I deal with the details of the highways programme. That has been tabled in the House, and copies will be available to the hon. members, as to the highways programme for the next year.

It has been noted that motor traffic in Ontario continues to increase at a rapid pace. Total registrations rose in 1955 by 8.6 per cent. to 1,617,000, an increase of 145 per cent. in the last decade.

To help resolve this problem, the province, together with the municipalities has this fiscal year carried out the biggest highway and road construction programme in Ontario's history. The Ontario Government's own expenditures, aside from those made by the municipalities out of their own revenues, total \$157 million, of which \$68 million was for new construction of provincial highways and \$42 million for municipal subsidies.

This huge programme is \$45 million greater than a year ago and unparalleled in our history. In addition to this provincial programme, the municipalities themselves spent another \$45 million from their own resources, making the total programme over \$200 million.

As to the municipalities, there is every indication that their volume of road construction will again rise. To meet their request, provincial road subsidies will be increased to \$50 million and this will be matched by an approximately equal expenditure by the municipalities themselves, so that the total expenditure on municipal roads—including both new construction and maintenance—will be about \$100 million.

Nor shall I go into the programme of public works. This is also tabled, and copies of it will be available.

In recent years, to meet the backlog of works which were required, we have been doing our best to overcome those deficiencies, and during the current fiscal year ending March 31 we will have spent on renovation and rehabilitation of existing structures, and on new construction, a total of \$25.4 million.

I might mention many of the major projects to be continued, and to be carried on this coming year:

A new Teachers' College in Hamilton; a new 500-bed unit at the Ontario Hospital, Kingston; the 6 nearly completed patients' pavilions at the Brockville Ontario Hospital, in addition to two new continued-treatment buildings with accommodation for 206 patients at the same hospital; a 500-bed self-contained tuberculosis unit at the Ontario Hospital, Woodstock; the first group of

buildings for the new 1,200-bed Ontario Hospital at North Bay; and an additional 150-bed unit for accommodation of the criminally insane at the Penetanguishene hospitals.

These major projects, together with other undertakings, will require \$44 million to be allocated to capital account in 1956-57. New work alone will involve a total commitment of \$12.5 million.

Among the new projects to be undertaken is a new hospital for mentally defective children which will be on the model of the hospitals at Orillia and Smiths Falls. Plans will call for an initial installation of 1,000 beds. In view of the scale of the projects to be carried forward over several years, the government's public works programme will have a long-term stabilizing influence upon construction activity and employment. I understand the new hospital for the mentally-defective children will be situated somewhere in south-western Ontario.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into details in regard to "Hydro". That has also been fully explained by the hon. Minister recently in this House.

The task of financing the expansion of Ontario Hydro is one in which the government has had a major role.

Over the past 13 years, \$1,300 million has been raised for this purpose on provincial debentures or on Ontario Hydro's bearing the province's guarantee.

I wish to speak now about assistance to municipalities. In the current fiscal year grants for schools, hospitals, municipal roads and many other purposes totalled \$163,200,000, and next year it is anticipated that they will rise to \$184,700,000. This is a remarkable advance from \$20 million provided only a dozen years ago. Among the conditional grants, the largest is for education which, including the \$6 per pupil grant, will amount to \$84 million in the fiscal year 1956-57, as I said previously.

In several of the traditional fields, such as municipal roads, the province's subsidies have been increased from less

than \$5 million in 1943-44 to \$50 million in 1956-57, a 10-fold increase. Payments to hospitals have been stepped up from \$1,600,000 in 1943-44 to \$21,400,000 in 1955-56, or almost 14-fold.

In addition, this government has pioneered several new types of assistance. The most important of these is the unconditional per capita grants which are considered by nearly all municipalities to be a satisfactory method of assisting municipalities. These grants will total \$12,800,000 in 1956-57. Another step initiated by this government was the introduction of The Municipal Taxation Assistance Act in 1952, which provides the municipalities with about \$650,000 in lieu of municipal taxes on provincial properties. In addition, local revenues are obtained under this Act from Ontario Hydro and other public utilities.

The payment of grants for homes for the aged, for day nurseries and for community centres are other new assistance measures we have introduced. Payment of grants to designated mining municipalities is also an important feature of the government's programme: these grants totalled \$1,500,000 this year, but for next year an expropriation of \$2 million is being provided.

As I have indicated, the grants payable to municipalities, school boards, and other local agencies have now reached the impressive table of \$185 million. This is more than \$21 million or 13 per cent. above last year's assistance. There can be no doubt that the transfer of \$185 million for municipal purposes helps to raise standards of local services, and relieve the local taxpayer. Of every \$2 of municipal tax levy, the province contributes \$1. In other words, our grants are 50 per cent. of the aggregate municipal tax levy. By the same token, this assistance represents a heavy drain on the province's own financial resources, amounting at the present time to 40 per cent. of our current revenue.

During the past year, federal-provincial conferences were held in April, June and October.



Hon. members will recall that following World War II, a series of conferences were held between the Federal Government and the provinces. The major problem which has emerged between the two levels of government in Canada concerns the distribution of tax revenues. In 1942, Ontario agreed to suspend its corporation and personal income tax levies. In return for this, the Federal Government reimbursed the province in an amount equal to the provincial revenue from these taxes in 1940. On March 31, 1947, these arrangements were terminated.

In entering the post-war era, the provinces faced the prospect of vastly increased expenditures. A number of the provinces have very limited revenue resources; all were concerned about the possible burden of unemployment, for the experience of the 1930's was still fresh in their minds. Some form of fiscal arrangement or understanding between the Federal Government and the provinces appeared to be essential for the balanced growth of the nation as a whole. Then in the course of time, a series of rental agreements have been considered and concluded at Ottawa.

In 1950, a new option was proposed by the Federal Government, giving more realistic recognition to Ontario's tax yields. In consequence of this offer, and our assessment of the revenue prospects from our own sources, Ontario signed an agreement suspending its rights to levy corporation and personal income taxes for a certain period.

The principle lying behind that agreement was that we would surrender our right to collect those two large fields of taxation and, in return, receive what is called a "rental" or an amount which is calculated to be greater than the amount of revenue that would be derived from taxes which we surrendered. At least, that was the principle which was intended to be incorporated in those agreements.

Under that agreement, we received in 1952 somewhat in excess of \$123 million. In 1956-57, it is estimated that we will receive \$151,700,000.

At the conferences in April and October last year, the Federal Government proposed a new series of fiscal arrangements for a 5-year period. There is a different principle involved. Instead of a rental agreement, it is proposed that the Federal Government will withdraw, to a certain extent, from its share in the major taxation fields, and allow the provinces to enter in; and the provinces then will decide upon how much they propose to exercise the right to tax within those limits.

Further, it is proposed that the Federal Government will abate or withdraw from the personal income tax field to the extent of 10 per cent. of the federal tax, including the old age security tax; on corporations, 9 per cent. of the taxable income of corporations deemed to be earned in the province; and on successions 50 per cent. of the federal duty. Where a Provincial Government undertakes not to impose any one or all of these taxes, the Federal Government would pay to such provincial governments each year an amount equal to the yield of the standard tax in that field in that province.

In addition to the amounts provided for, the Federal Government will pay unconditional equalization grants to the various provinces to the extent required to bring them into line. We always have agreed with some system which will distribute tax revenues in this country for the benefit of some provinces which have less lucrative taxation resources than some of the industrial provinces. We have always favoured such a step, and the equalization payments are intended as a means of carrying out that objective.

From our viewpoint, the new proposal has several advantages. Chiefly, it affords a considerably greater degree of flexibility, and there are provisions whereby the Federal Government will agree to collect the tax which is to be imposed by the province, and instead of paying back in the form of a rent, it will pay exactly the amount which it collects in that field.

There is an advantage too in having the amount of subsidy element in the

payments to the other provinces brought out into the open where it may be clearly seen.

And, finally, although it is not possible to make accurate calculations, inasmuch as they depend upon the future levels of corporation profits and personal incomes, it is very likely that the revenues to Ontario under the new arrangement will be somewhat higher than those available to it under the terms of the rental agreement now in effect. We believe the general principle involved in the proposal to share taxes in this manner is sound.

There are, however, two main defects in the federal proposal. These relate to the method of determining the equalization payments. This is always a complicated matter to explain. This method is based upon the weighted average of the per capita tax yields of Ontario and British Columbia in the 3 main direct tax fields. They take the two provinces which have the highest per capita tax from corporation, income tax and succession duties, and that becomes the standard, and the other provinces which have less per capita tax from those fields, by equalization payments, are supposed to receive enough to bring them up to that level.

That sounds perhaps more complicated than it is. However, that is what is intended to be done. By this method, the provinces which have lower per capita tax are adjusted up to the average of Ontario and British Columbia.

The Ontario Government, although we support, as I have said, the fiscal need payments to those provinces which generally need them, seriously doubts that the present formula achieves this purpose because, after all, this formula is based entirely upon the yield of 3 taxes. Those 3 taxes are the most important in Ontario because it is an industrial province. Alberta's greatest source of revenue is from its oil royalties, and the development of a natural resource, which is not considered in this calculation at all. Similarly, in other provinces, there may be other sources of revenue which are not considered in working out this agreement.

What we say, therefore, is that a much sounder approach would be to adopt the average per capita tax yields of all the provinces as the yardstick, or in the the alteration the average per capita tax yields in the 4 highest provinces, which would be Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec and Alberta.

The second defect in the proposal seems to us to lie in the failure to recognize adequately the compelling needs and heavy burdens that rapidly growing population and industry impose. Such growth in this century creates enormous demands for educational facilities and the other things mentioned in this Budget presentation. Servicing industry is very costly.

Yet the federal formula does not take this into account. All the provinces except Ontario receive special federal payments. Their revenues in the 3 main direct tax fields are raised virtually to the per capita yields in Ontario, which produce half of Canada's manufacturing output and contribute half the Federal Government's direct tax revenue. To starve Ontario services or force it into unsound taxation practices will inevitably lower the standards of service and well-being in all provinces.

We would, therefore, urge that there be a realistic appreciation of our fiscal requirements, and that a share of the total tax revenue be allocated to this province sufficient to enable it to provide the services that its expanding industry and population require.

One of the matters which has been dealt with at the federal-provincial conferences has been the question of unemployment assistance, and here again we feel very strongly that the proposal which has been made is completely unsound. No one will question that the best way of dealing with unemployment is to provide useful work.

It was partly with this objective in mind that, last year, when unemployment was causing some anxiety, we embarked upon an expanded programme of capital works. Virtually all people would prefer useful work to direct relief or "hand-outs." While this policy

will not meet all needs in all situations, it is the feeling which the provinces and municipalities can make their greatest contribution. Their financial resources are restricted and, inevitably the funds which are channeled into direct unemployment relief necessitate a contraction in the money made available for carrying out essential capital projects. Under our Constitution, the great majority of useful works fall within the orbit of the provinces or municipalities, and it is in these fields that their energies and resources should be concentrated.

Moreover, it should not be overlooked that any curtailment of these provincial and municipal services, as a result of lack of funds, will undoubtedly have the effect in the long run of reducing the potential revenue of the Federal Government itself. For the most part, provincial expenditures are productive. They provide the environment in which industry may grow and expand. They provide for the development of the skills of the people by education and in other ways. They provide for maintenance of standards of health. Indirectly and directly, they contribute widely, and in varied ways, monies which generate employment. Nearly all expenditures of a provincial government in one way or another, give impetus to revenue-producing activities.

It would be very short-sighted, because of heavy federal burdens, for defence and other objectives to overlook the long-term necessity of permitting the provinces to make full provision for the utmost development of their manpower and material resources for it is from these that the revenues of the Federal Government are derived.

At the meetings of the Federal and Provincial Governments in April and June of last year, it was suggested by the Ontario Government that the province and the municipalities continue to provide assistance for the unemployables, which we have been doing, and that the Federal Government bear the full responsibility for assisting the able-bodied unemployed.

The unemployment relief proposal submitted to the province gives but

grudging recognition to these representations. It still leaves the province and the municipalities with the burden of financing the whole cost of unemployment assistance for the unemployables and, in addition, imposes upon the province and the municipalities the burden of financing 50 per cent. of the cost of assistance payments to indigent unemployed workers as well as the cost of administration.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago the hon. Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Frost) concluded his Budget Address upon a note of confidence in the great continuing developments that lie ahead. For these developments, boldly conceived and intelligently planned, will increase the efficiency and productivity of our workers and our industry. During the months that followed, we have taken advantage of the provisions of the Budget that made allowance for these developments.

We, as a province, have done our full share in our contribution to employment. And we have built—and have assisted in the building—hospitals, schools, public structures, highways, bridges, conservation projects and many other undertakings. These all go to the maintenance and broadening of what the then hon. Treasurer called “an economic environment that fosters confidence, that is friendly to new ideas, that has the capacity of adaptability, that gives incentive to industrial expansion and preserves the right of earning and retaining just rewards.” That, we consider to be our job. We have pressed it forward during the last 12 months at a greater pace than ever before.

The Budget for 1956-57 makes provision for a continuation of this programme of development. In every department responsible for some phase of development, the Estimates are increased. None has been neglected, and in some instances, we have entered upon commitments, such as the \$35 million which we have pledged for the northern section of the natural gas pipe line, which will give great impetus to our development.



Yet in this Budget, there is a special emphasis. That emphasis is upon education. In addition to the unprecedented increase in the grants to schools, it lays a special stress upon the universities. The total amount provided for our institutions of higher learning represents an increase far greater than has ever appeared in any single Budget in the history of Ontario.

It was not so many years ago when industry and business generally looked somewhat askance at university graduates. In the interval, attitudes have drastically changed. In almost all walks of life, new and varied opportunities have opened up for men and women with some professional training and general higher education. Our institutions have established a standard of merit which has received general recognition. Industry and business seek trained minds. Parents who missed the opportunity for higher education themselves now fully realize that it is an advantage and they wish it for their children. The problem of university enrolment is becoming one of great magnitude.

The programme of development in this province needs graduates of the universities for its fulfilment. It needs engineers, architects and all manner of men of science. Without them in increasing numbers, progress will be frustrated. The growing population requires doctors, dentists, nurses, and others who are trained to preserve good health and relieve the sick.

Practical science depends, for its effective development, upon scientific research. All this represents a constantly pressing demand which we must take steps to meet. And looming up as a pall of uncertain but sombre reality, we perceive a concentration upon training in the sciences in countries where those who rule do not think in the way that we think. Science has become a fundamental bulwark in the line of defence against terrifying possibilities.

Let us not forget that education for us is not the same thing as in some countries. For in some countries the

whole paraphernalia of science is diverted to serve the objectives of the state. With us education is conceived as of a different essence. It is designed to provide the environment for a breadth of view, for freedom of discussion, for the dispassionate search for truth. With all their shortcomings, in spite of all the raw edges and occasional turbulence so characteristic of undergraduate life, our universities do create this indispensable environment. Many students may emerge as highly trained specialists in some chosen field, yet they have had the opportunity of contact with the humanities.

In our urgent need for persons of special scientific training, let us not overlook the fact that the great issues that arise from time to time in our country are human issues. We are faced constantly with the clash of ideas. It is in the universities that men and women learn the discipline of study, learn to discuss opinions from all viewpoints, learn to separate the true from the false. It is there that they can best gain a perspective of the vast sweep of history, and come face to face with the thoughts of the great minds of all the ages. It is there that they may learn to live in the discipline of liberty. From thence may be derived some understanding of the basic problems and the causes that lie behind the conflict of ideas.

It is not the competition for scientific supremacy wherein the danger lies. It is in the conflict of ideas. Science is essential for our material progress and the defence of our liberty. The threat to our safety and our liberty comes from ideas that cannot be reconciled. The ultimate value of our universities lies in their breadth of vision, in their independence, in their liberty. We have a more pressing need for them than ever before. The major human issues will be resolved, if they ever will be resolved, by knowledge, disciplined understanding, and the wisdom that flows from these. Our schools with their 1,000,000 pupils, our universities with their rising enrolments, are constantly

subject to the white light of public scrutiny and criticism. In spite of the inevitable shortcomings of a system that suffers from the pangs of rapid growth, these institutions are an integral part of our way of life. The evidence of the quality of the system is a generation of young men and women who are better informed, more self-reliant, more alive to the manifold opportunities that lie ahead of them than any generation that has gone before.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that we shall proceed with the Budget debate and with the criticisms by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer) and by the financial critic of the CCF on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to proceed, in the intervening period—today, tomorrow and Monday—with Estimates and Bills.

We propose to proceed tomorrow with the Metropolitan Bill, in order that it may be referred to the committee. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) has sufficiently recovered from his great speech of today, we will proceed with his Estimates tomorrow. On Monday, we will proceed, in committee, with the All-Canada Pipe Line Bill and with the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, if it meets with the approval of the House, at this time I would like to proceed with some other business on the Order paper.

Hon Mr. Frost moves the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

HON. MR. FROST: For the benefit of the new hon. members in this House, I may say that the procedure which we have followed for the last few years is

that before the formal adoption of the Budget and the determination of the motion, which usually determines the fate of the government, we proceed with the Estimates. We will proceed in the ordinary course with Estimates from this time on.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, what is the procedure now? Is the House going to proceed with Estimates now?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Where are they?

HON. MR. FROST: They are in the envelopes which are being distributed.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister cannot expect us to discuss intelligently Estimates we have not yet seen. There is a great deal of other business with which we could proceed.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would prefer that the Estimates be held over, I am quite satisfied to hold them over until tomorrow. I always endeavour to accommodate the hon. member and will do so in this case also. I had thought we might proceed with one or two of the Estimates which usually provoke no discussion. These are the Estimates of the office of the Lieutenant-Governor and those of the office of the Prime Minister. They are one or two Estimates which clear the way for the principal Estimates in which the hon. member would be interested. However, if he would prefer they stand over, I am quite satisfied to proceed with another order of business.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, I think we are entitled to at least have an opportunity to look at the Estimates.

HON. MR. FROST: Very well. In the meantime the hon. member will have the Estimates in his hands. Perhaps the objection may be withdrawn a little later in the afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee. Mr. Edwards in the chair.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg leave to inform the House that the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, that the moneys required for purposes of sections 7 and 8 of Bill No. 103, "The Charitable Institutions Act, 1956," shall during the fiscal year 1956-57 be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

### THE MINING ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

Sections 1, 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Chairman, I am at some disadvantage, as I had no idea that this matter was to be brought before the House this afternoon, and some of the relevant notes are in my office. This seems to be a bit of a poker game, as to what matters are to be dealt with here, and it seems as if one would need to come in laden to cope with any one of 90 Bills.

Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to raise now is as follows. I have not the quotation here, but in the early moments of the hon. Attorney-General's remarks the last time we debated this Bill, he read from a prepared statement which he had brought into the House. He outlined the problem presented by the abolition of the Mining Court or, alternatively, the problem with which, by the

establishment of the Mining Court, an attempt was made to cope with the provision of more flexible arrangements to deal with patented lands and the early development of mining claims.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the House that if hon. members wish to find the case I attempted to make, in a rather heated debate here on the last occasion on which it was raised, they will find it very succinctly put by the hon. Attorney-General himself, in a statement which he introduced before I had the opportunity of making my speech.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it was a prepared statement. It was a statement made to the House.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, it was a prepared statement the hon. Attorney-General made, and was prepared before the particular issue I was raising was brought before the House.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, it came as a result of the debate which arose in the House. It was not a statement that I had prepared at all.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I have a very distinct recollection of the hon. Attorney-General rising in his place and holding a paper in his hand and apparently following it very closely.

HON. MR. FROST: That might be so. I also have a number of papers here.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, this is a problem which must be faced by the mining industry, one to which I attempted to draw the attention of the House on the last occasion. It is a problem concerning a very basic feature, at the start of the development of mining claims.

This is going to be taken out of the hands of the Mining Board with all its flexibility, and, to a great extent, is to be taken into the regular courts, with all their restrictions. This is a problem which will give rise to very serious concern in the minds of people who are



interested in the future of the mining industry.

As a matter of fact, I had hoped to have, when we discussed this again, some rather interesting documentation of the thinking of the hon. Attorney-General himself on the nature of this problem.

For example, in the year 1932, after the Mining Court had been established for a few years and they were attempting to cope with these problems, there was still some uncertainty as to whether or not the Mining Court had sufficient jurisdiction. There was also still some feeling that there were too many uncertainties of jurisdiction. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts)—in his private capacity as a barrister—was responsible for giving leadership to the preparing of a petition, which was signed by 50 or 60 of the leading people in the mining industry. I have a copy of the petition in my office. Any hon. member of the House who would like to see it, may do so. I will be glad to show it to him.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I would say frankly my memory does not run back in detail for 30 years. I do not know what the hon. member is getting at. Perhaps he should explain.

MR. MacDONALD: Here once again is the disadvantage of something like this being "pulled out of a hat" when hon. members did not know we were going to discuss it today. I shall show this to the hon. Attorney-General after the debate is over if he has forgotten it completely. It is an exact copy of a petition and a letter sent to the hon. Attorney-General at that time. The gist of it is that the hon. Attorney-General was responsible at that time for attempting to get the then hon. Attorney-General of the Province of Ontario, and the appropriate federal authorities, to broaden still more the jurisdiction of the Mining Court, in the belief that there were still certain restrictions there which were hampering the development of the mining industry.

That is a rather serious documentation of the difficulties which are going to be faced.

HON. MR. FROST: Perhaps the hon. member might do better if he had the papers with him.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the hon. Prime Minister postpone this for one minute? I can get them.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: We might proceed with Private Bills in the meantime.

MR. NIXON: That ought to be safe.

HON. MR. FROST: That ought to be fair enough. Let the hon. member for York South get his ammunition.

#### UNITED CO-OPERATIVES OF ONTARIO

House in Committee on Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the United Co-operatives of Ontario."

Sections 1 to 5 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 16 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may we revert to the third order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Revert back to Bill No. 90. On section 4.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, this historical document which is so historical that the hon. Attorney-General has altogether forgotten about it, is addressed to the hon. Minister of Justice for Canada, the hon. Attorney-General of Ontario, the hon. Minister of Mines for Canada, and the hon. Minister of Mines for Ontario. There are 4 paragraphs. Perhaps I might read it all.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: From where did it come?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Attorney-General has a very good idea where it came from.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That is not the point. I am asking the hon. member where it came from.

MR. MacDONALD: I have a copy—and it is a true copy—if the hon. Attorney-General wants to check the facts.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That is not the point. I asked the hon. member, before he proceeded any further, if he would identify the source of it.

MR. MacDONALD: That is irrelevant, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. FROST: Most of what the hon. member for York South says is irrelevant.

MR. MacDONALD: That is what the hon. Prime Minister says at the moment.

Whereas a Mining Court was created for the Province of Ontario by The Mining Court Act, 1924, and certain limited jurisdiction was conferred upon the said Court, and upon the Judge thereof,

And whereas there have been numerous occasions where proceedings commenced in the said Mining Court and dealing with matters arising out of mining, have not been fully adjudicated upon therein by reason of lack of jurisdiction of the Court to deal with them, occasioning delay, expense and uncertainty.

And whereas in the interests of an ever growing and intensely important industry, as well as that of litigants and others seeking to come before the said Court, it would seem advisable to extend the powers of the said Court and to define the procedure therein, and give to the Judge thereof increased status and powers.

Now therefore the undersigned hereby respectfully petition for a thorough review of the situation, and

the enactment of the necessary legislation to enable the Mining Court of Ontario to deal with all matters arising, whether directly or indirectly, out of or pertaining to mining in its various phases, and to give to the said Mining Court and the Judge thereof, full and sufficient powers and jurisdiction to deal with and dispose of all such matters as may come before it.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dated this 6th day of May, 1932.

HON. MR. FROST: Who signed it?

MR. MacDONALD: Would you like to hear the names?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: Very well. You asked for it.

| <i>Name</i>              | <i>Address</i>      |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| M. G. Hunt.....          | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| Gerald D. O'Meara.....   | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| P. G. Burns.....         | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| Albert Serre.....        | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| L. A. Lillico.....       | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| H. J. Fine.....          | Kirkland Lake, Ont. |
| A. K. Roberts.....       | Toronto, Ont.       |
| P. J. Knox.....          | New Liskeard, Ont.  |
| Edwin W. Kearney.....    | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| Joseph A. Legris.....    | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| F. L. Smiley.....        | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| Edwin E. Pearlman.....   | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| C. F. Tuer.....          | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| William C. Inch.....     | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| W. H. Walter.....        | New Liskeard, Ont.  |
| R. D. Cumming.....       | Haileybury, Ont.    |
| O. W. Langdon.....       | Timmins, Ont.       |
| Gordon H. Gauthier.....  | Timmins, Ont.       |
| Dean Kester.....         | Timmins, Ont.       |
| A. C. Brown.....         | Timmins, Ont.       |
| S. A. Caldbick.....      | Timmins, Ont.       |
| R. Langdon.....          | Timmins, Ont.       |
| T. A. MacDonald.....     | Timmins, Ont.       |
| O. Sauve.....            | Timmins, Ont.       |
| J. M. Forbes.....        | Timmins, Ont.       |
| S. C. Platus.....        | Timmins, Ont.       |
| James E. Day.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| E. W. Wright.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| J. B. Allen.....         | Toronto, Ont.       |
| Lewis Duncan.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| T. R. Deacon.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| W. M. Gordon.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| George A. Grover.....    | Toronto, Ont.       |
| D. W. Lang.....          | Toronto, Ont.       |
| A. G. Slaght.....        | Toronto, Ont.       |
| Charles Evans Lewis..... | Toronto, Ont.       |
| W. B. McPherson.....     | Toronto, Ont.       |

Everybody in the mining industry, to put it briefly. It is a glossary of all the people who were in the mining industry in the year 1932. They were all back of the hon. Attorney-General. They wanted the doubtful jurisdiction of the Mining Court clarified.

HON. MR. FROST: Read all the names.

MR. MacDONALD: Very well; to continue.

|                          |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| W. R. Wadsworth.....     | Toronto, Ont.      |
| H. J. Martin.....        | Toronto, Ont.      |
| John A. Dyke.....        | Fort William, Ont. |
| F. R. Norris.....        | Fort William, Ont. |
| Fred Babe.....           | Fort William, Ont. |
| Harry H. Beeman.....     | Fort William, Ont. |
| D. R. Byers.....         | Fort William, Ont. |
| A. H. Dowler.....        | Fort William, Ont. |
| C. D. LeMay.....         | Fort William, Ont. |
| J. McComber.....         | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| A. J. McComber.....      | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| J. A. Royce McCuaig..... | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| P. V. Ibbetson.....      | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| R. L. Seaman.....        | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| D. J. Cowan.....         | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| J. Reeve.....            | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| George M. Miller.....    | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| W. M. Brodie.....        | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. J. O'Connor.....      | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| W. J. Matthews.....      | Port Arthur, Ont.  |
| E. C. Facer.....         | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. H. Clary.....         | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. M. Cooper.....        | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| Frank J. Kehoe.....      | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. A. Plouffe.....       | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| Geo. J. Valin.....       | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| O. A. Lauxon.....        | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| G. E. Buchanan.....      | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| H. J. Fournier.....      | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. Paul Magean.....      | Sudbury, Ont.      |
| J. N. Desmarais.....     | Sudbury, Ont.      |

That is the end of the list containing about 50 or 60 names, including those of most of the leading people in the mining industry at that time.

I want to pay tribute to the hon. Attorney-General. At that time, he was leading most of the people in the mining industry in the establishment of an extension of the powers of the Mining Court and removal of the uncertainty in the powers of the Mining Court, so that it could do something to meet the needs of the mining industry, and do it in the most effective way possible. Now the hon. Attorney-General is a member of a government which is wiping the Mining Court out altogether.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might answer that point, now that he has drawn attention to the petition?

MR. MacDONALD: Does the hon. Attorney-General remember it now?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I remember there was a petition. I would like to say at the time that petition was prepared, most of the lawyers practicing in the Mining Court had petitions presented to them by somebody. At any rate, they have signed—if that document is correct.

I take it, however, that the hon. member for York South has not produced this file from the hon. Attorney-General's Department, because no request has been made to me to search for an old file of that sort, although the letter is directed to the hon. Attorney-General of the day, who, I take it, was hon. Mr. Price. I remember at the same time there was a Conservative government in Ottawa and the hon. Minister of Mines was Wesley Gordon of Haileybury, and I am also certain had there been any reason to do anything of a major nature the Attorney-General of Ontario with the hon. Minister of Mines, Mr. Gordon, at Ottawa and with a Conservative government in power here, would have taken steps to have corrected the situation—if there was anything which required correction.

Nearly 30 years have passed. Nothing of a major nature, that I can remember, was done then, nor has been done since, and we are dealing with an entirely different situation today. I do not admit this document, but if this is a revelation of certain thinking on my part 24 years ago, which is different than it is today, I would expect my thinking today to be more mature than it was then.

HON. MR. FROST: I have a long memory in some things political and I believe that was drawn up by the judge himself. Everybody who had anything to do with The Department of Mines and with the administration of that particular office knows that his honour—or “his lordship,” as he has been called



because he is a judge of the Supreme Court—was very jealous of that position, and was very anxious to secure an extension of his powers. I have no doubt that came from the judge's files and, no doubt, he prepared it. That is my recollection.

As regards the petition, I would like to say to the hon. member for York South, if he would stand on the corner of College Street and University Avenue, with a petition to give him \$1 million, or to send him to jail for life, or something of that sort, he could easily get 1,000 people to sign it within the next hour. That is the extent of the value there is in the document which the hon. member has read today.

MR. MacDONALD: This is a very interesting display on the part of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Attorney-General in regard to this important document. I do not know by whom it was drawn up, but the significant thing is that when a person signs his name to a document presumably he signs it seriously, particularly if it has to do with an important matter in public affairs. To try to dismiss it as sort of a petition to collect at Yonge and Front Streets is just irrelevant. This is obviously a serious petition.

Granted, the hon. Attorney-General has matured a little in the last 24 years but, irrespective of whether he was as mature then as he is now, he was dealing with a previous petition and getting leading people in the mining industry to sign it. I do not wish to pursue this any further than to draw attention to the fact that any attempt to under-estimate the significance of the contribution that the Mining Court has made and the effective job it has done in the mining industry, and suggesting and under-estimating the difficulties the mining industry is going to face when these basic issues are taken into the courts, is doing a disservice to the mining industry by trying to—

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I would inform the hon. member that 95 per cent. of the cases are handled by the commissioner,

and are so handled in 9 provinces, and only 5 per cent. are handled by a judge, as is done in all other provinces of Canada.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister made that explanation the last time, and I repeat the comment which I made the last time, that while it may be that 95 per cent. of the issues to be decided in the mining industry go before the commissioner. But that does not change the fact that the other 5 per cent., having to do with patented lands are the most important, are the whole basis upon which the industry is built. Therefore, to set off the 95 against the 5 and say that is an insignificant, and sort of meaningless grasp of the issues which have to be settled, is to ignore once again the basic fact that the settlement of patent lands—

MR. MACAULAY: In Saskatchewan they have a commissioner.

MR. MacDONALD: No, they do not have a commissioner in Saskatchewan. That is another irrelevant remark.

MR. WARDROPE: Tell us about it.

MR. MacDONALD: May I give the answer which is always given when the question of Saskatchewan is raised—and perhaps throw it back into the face of the hon. member—"we are talking about the situation in Ontario."

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member always raises the question of Saskatchewan.

MR. MacDONALD: Now hon. members opposite are raising it. Perhaps they are getting on. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members want to have a good time let them go ahead and have it, but I will stand here until they have chattered themselves into silence, and then go ahead, so let them chatter on for 5 minutes if they want to.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: A brave, brave man.

MR. MacDONALD: "Young Loch-invar."

HON. MR. DUNBAR: "Young Lochinvar who comes out of the West."

MR. MacDONALD: This is something the hon. Attorney-General himself was attempting to get 20 years ago and which I have right here. Let me quote it, now that I have my notes. This is what the hon. Attorney-General said in the debate.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I can shorten this by saying that what I said a few years ago was my idea of the matter. No matter what I thought 20 years ago, surely, I am entitled to change my mind.

MR. MacDONALD: The thing I am drawing to the hon. Attorney-General's attention is—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South changed his mind in less than 24 years. He formerly supported the Conservative Party, now he is CCF.

MR. MacDONALD: Twenty-four years ago I did not have a vote. Mr. Chairman, what I am attempting to draw to your attention and the attention of the hon. Attorney-General is that he has not changed his mind in 24 years. That is a significant point. In 1932, he was not happy with the Mining Court, he wanted its powers extended in some degree to eliminate the uncertainties as to its jurisdiction. He was quite in favour of the Mining Court because of the job it was doing, and if I may quote from page 367 of this year's *Hansard*:

In the main, the purpose of many of the provisions which appear in the Mining Court part of the Act, as it is today—that appear in the new amending Act and which appeared before the Mining Court was established, in the period mentioned, 1908 to 1934—was primarily to obtain speedy decisions on mining matters in relation to unpatented and very often newly staked mining claims. The purpose was also to get away from the formality—

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That is exactly what this commission will do.

MR. MacDONALD:

The purpose was also to get away from the formality of court proceedings and delays.

I am talking about what this government could have done starting in 1945, and particularly in 1951, if the hon. members of this government had been willing to treat the situation in a decent manner.

HON. MR. FROST: What should have been done then?

MR. MacDONALD: With regard to the judge—

HON. MR. FROST: Tell us about it.

MR. MacDONALD: Do you want me to drag all the skeletons out?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What should we have done?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I object to that method of referring to the judge. That is strong language.

MR. MacDONALD: I did not refer to the judge as a "skeleton".

HON. MR. PORTER: Do not whisper, tell us about it.

MR. MacDONALD: In 1951, if this government—and particularly, the hon. Prime Minister—had been willing to do the right thing, there would have been a very good chance of securing a second appointment.

HON. MR. FROST: What else should we have done?

MR. MacDONALD: I am not in a position to tell at the present time. There are certain people with sensibilities who do not want their names dragged into public view but I will tell you this, that one day the whole story will be told.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Tell it now.

HON. MR. FROST: Go ahead.

MR. MacDONALD: I have certain respect for suggestions on the part of certain people who at the moment do not want their names dragged into public view, and I am going to respect that. Hon. members may smile now, but when the whole story is told they will not be smiling.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to underline what is undoubtedly the case here, and there is no one who would deny that the kind of situation which we propose has no alternative, but because of the government's bungling it has created the situation of setting up a commission that has 5 per cent.—the important 5 per cent.—of the cases being forced to go into the courts—

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon. member realize he is “off the beam” as far as he can be, because all cases could always have been taken into court? Under the Act the Mining Court did not have anything to do with a patent.

MR. MacDONALD: That is all very fine, the hon. Attorney-General makes a distinction between the forfeiting of patents and the controlling of patents, and all I can say, as a non-lawyer, is that there are other lawyers who disagree with that, because the whole issue of patented lands and forfeiture of patents—

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The Act as it now stands provides that it can be brought into the Supreme Court on the motion of either party.

MR. MacDONALD: Let me get down to a couple of questions on what has been brought in here to meet the needs of the mining industry.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The mining industry seems to be quite happy about it. There have been no protests that I know of.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have not had one single, solitary person speak to me about this matter, and it has been on the Order paper for 3 weeks.

MR. MacDONALD: Most of them know what has been happening during the past, and there is no alternative to it. The first question I want to ask—

MR. MALONEY: Is that all the hon. member wants to talk about? My people sent me up here to work, and I do not want my time wasted by such nonsense.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member should refrain from insinuations.

MR. MacDONALD: That is fine, if it is applied to the ones who started this. There are two questions I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General or the hon. Minister of Mines, and then I want to go back to the question raised by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer). I would like the hon. Attorney-General to give an explanation which he did not offer but just seemed to dismiss on the issue that was raised, because there may be more in it than I thought when it was raised by the hon. member. That is the question of whether this is a constitutional or unconstitutional set-up. I would like the hon. Minister to comment on that.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on the advice of our legal officers we believe that this Bill as now presented will stand, and that it is constitutional.

MR. MacDONALD: That is just a statement of fact; give us a statement as to why you feel it is constitutional or not. If you take sections 118, 119 and 120, that is all in section 4, Mr. Chairman, you have a very interesting set-up established to cope with those cases which come up for decision.

If I might once again resort to the layman's language I used the last time, what they have is a “shuttle service”



between the mining commissioner and the court. After evidence comes before the mining commissioner and after some consideration of it, if it becomes evident, or is believed to be beyond its jurisdiction, it goes to the court. If it goes before the court, and the court considers it is really something the Mining Court could consider, it may be switched back to the mining commissioner.

HON. MR. FROST: What value has this to the discussion? A moment ago the hon. member said that he thought Ottawa would not make the appointment of a mining judge and gave as the reasons for it, some obscure statement that we had "bungled" somewhere along the line. What the "bungling" is, I do not know. However, if the appointment cannot be made, and if the hon. member has authority for that statement—I do not know anything about it—but if such is the case, what is the use of asking about something which cannot be done?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, it is the hon. Prime Minister who is wasting time. I am not asking what can be done, I am asking about the details of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: What section are you on?

MR. MacDONALD: Section 4 of the amendment on the top of page 3, sections 118, 119 and 120. What I have suggested is that you have the sort of arrangement I have described as a "shuttle service," whereby an issue comes before the commissioner, and would be switched to the court, if it is believed to be beyond the commissioner's jurisdiction; and conversely, if it comes into the courts and the courts feel that it really was something the mining commissioner could consider, then it is switched back to the mining commissioner.

The question I want to ask of the hon. Attorney-General or the hon. Prime Minister is this: suppose one of these cases comes before either the mining commissioner or the court, and a

judgment is rendered and there is an appeal, is there not the ghost of the McLean case hanging over this whole set-up? In many instances the appeal will be taken by the litigant who has lost, on the basis that it was heard in the wrong court, and that it was before the judge when it should have been before the commissioner, or it was before the commissioner when it should have been before the judge. There will be appeals taken on the basis of the case not being in the right jurisdiction for decision.

In other words, there is fundamentally a bad set-up under which people who are bringing their cases before the courts are not certain in which jurisdiction it should be, and the courts may change their minds anywhere along the line.

HON. P. T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): You are only substituting here the word "commissioner" for "judge"; and you have The Mining Act itself, which provides that all patented land cases will be dealt with by a Supreme Court judge. The mining industry, I might say, insofar as I know, are all in favour of it. The Prospectors and Developers Association have assured me they are in favour, and I can assure you the mining industry is in favour of getting its backlog of cases cleared up.

MR. MacDONALD: I agree with that, I will not dispute that they ought to be cleared up, but all I want to say, as one layman to another layman, is that it is very simple to suggest that patented cases are to go to the courts, and all other cases to the commissioner. But the line of demarcation is not as clear as that. There are going to be a number of cases which will go before the mining commissioner and then be switched to the courts, and vice versa.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: May I clear that up? Briefly this subsection 121, about which you are speaking, provides for a transfer one way or the other. Here is what happens in court normally, and what would be the effect of this section. If the proceeding is taken in the Mining Court or before the mining

commissioner, as it will be, and either party wishes to move it into the Supreme Court, they have the power, under the Act, to make application and have it moved, and if the action is brought in the Supreme Court and the judge of the Supreme Court, in his view, or upon application of either party, feels it could be much better disposed of by the commissioner, he will transfer it back to the commissioner. That is what it means.

MR. MacDONALD: That is all very fine, but there have been judges who have rendered decisions which have been appealed, and the next court say the judge was wrong.

HON. MR. FROST: How would you handle it then?

MR. MacDONALD: All I am asking is, is not the ghost of the McLean case hanging over that? Cases which have come before the courts are going to be appealed, not on the basis of substance, but on the ground that they were in the wrong jurisdiction.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I said earlier, and I repeat, that there is no question in the minds of the legal officers of my department, who have been consulted in the wording of these sections, but that each of the sections is accurate and is capable of being enforced.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will have to let the matter rest there, because we can argue for hours on what could happen. But I just raised this as a very serious prospect that these cases are going to be appealed on the basis of being in the wrong jurisdiction. If that happens the McLean case will be haunting—and will have some serious effects on—the industry.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister—I have not read this but I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether or not any provision has been put in the Act to assure that a Supreme Court judge will be appointed to act in all of these instances?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I do not think an answer is necessary, the Supreme Court of Ontario has very obvious jurisdiction in these matters. I think there is a practical problem arising out of what the hon. member has said and what the hon. member for York South has said, that if these matters are dealt with by a number of judges, there will be methods, procedures and decisions which will not be uniform, and it is very desirable that one judge should be designated by the Chief Justice to handle these cases.

His lordship has been very kind in his consideration of this matter, and he is satisfied to designate one of the Supreme Court judges as a judge of the mining division. It is not unlike the admiralty judges, who are assigned to deal with certain specific matters. In so doing, we will provide the uniformity which is required, and will provide for the divided jurisdiction.

In these differences of jurisdiction between the commissioner and the mining judge, they apply in all cases. I would consider there is no more simple way which can be devised than, if it is found a commissioner is dealing with something beyond his jurisdiction, the matter can be transferred to one of the Supreme Court judges, and vice versa. I have no doubt it will work satisfactorily.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I agree with the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, but I think we are up against a practical problem that of knowing exactly how to tackle the Constitutional issue.

May I ask the hon. Attorney-General if the sections with which we are dealing now, 114 to 121, are taken verbatim from the old Mining Act?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: They are very similar, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINTERMEYER: The 1908 Act was called into constitutional question in the Monroe case. The other day we were speaking about the McLean case, and I think the hon. member for

York South said the government had devised a means of overcoming a constitutional issue.

The submission I have to make is this, Mr. Chairman; I am very much concerned with these sections, and the so-called "shuttle" which has been referred to is not sufficiently strong to protect against the constitutional issue. I quite agree with the government that it is up against a very practical problem, and the more I hear it discussed, the more I am concerned with the suggestion I made when this matter was last considered. I say again that to refer this matter to the Appeal Court for interpretation is the intelligent thing to do.

I agree with the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly), and I am sure the mining fraternity is desirous of doing this, but I do not want it to happen that after this has been enacted, and the House prorogues, we run into a series of appeals with the consequent long delays, all of which could be overcome by a very simple act of ours at the present time.

The last time we were speaking about the McLean case, but it is my understanding there was another case—the Monroe and Downey case—which called into question the constitutional problems in a situation where, in that case, they were dealing with sections which are either identical or very analogous to sections 114 to 121, about which we are speaking now.

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the case mentioned by the hon. member. We are not worried about the constitutionality of it. I do not think it has been the practice of this government—certainly not as long as I have been in this House—to run for cover by asking for decisions of the courts. The government is satisfied with what it is doing.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, my recollection of the Monroe case is that the then commissioner dealt with

certain matters relating to patent land. That had been the custom in commissioner's offices for many years previously and, as a result of what is termed the "Monroe case", it was held that a commissioner appointed under provincial jurisdiction was dealing with a matter which was federal in its aspects, and should be decided by a federally-appointed judge.

The genesis of a very remarkable arrangement, which was made about 30 years ago, was the simple expedient of having Judge Godson, who was then the commissioner, appointed as a Supreme Court judge. It was a very unique arrangement, indeed. The federal Order-in-Council provided for his appointment as a Superior Court judge, and provided that the province should both appoint and nominate such a person.

I do not know what great persuasive power my old friend, hon. Charles McCrae, had in Ottawa to procure that, because there it was not a government of the same stripe as his own. I think the Minister of Justice at that time was the Rt. hon. Ernest Lapointe.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister what year that was?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think it was in 1924, in the first King administration. It was an expedient adopted at that time to get over the problem of divided jurisdiction. I suppose that same method could have been adopted but the commissioner—then Mr. Godson; afterwards Mr. Justice Godson—had strong views on some of these things. He is a man who is now about 81 years of age. In those days he was a very able and widely-known mining official, and I think perhaps it was the feeling of all parties concerned, both here and at Ottawa, that the matter could be settled by the appointing of the then Mr. Godson, as a judge.

But I would say that in 1956, that is neither practical nor desirable. I think



we must meet the situation and get back to what should have been done 32 years ago. I think that is the situation. I do not think there is any constitutional issue in this at all. The problem is one of having the province, by its commissioner, determine the things which the commissioner can determine, and having a judge designated as a mining judge do the things which a federal judge can do, in the ordinary course of his jurisdiction, and the ordinary course of business.

I do not think this a parallel of the situation which existed at the time of the Monroe judgement. At that time the commissioner was obviously dealing with things beyond his jurisdiction, and the court so held. That, Mr. Chairman, is the genesis of an arrangement made in 1924.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if Judge Godson is to be retained as a consultant, under this set up?

HON. MR. FROST: No. Judge Godson is nearly 81 years of age.

MR. MacDONALD: So is Adenauer.

HON. MR. FROST: He is eligible for superannuation in the ordinary course of events. Sometimes, if employment can be found, in cases where a superannuated person, or a person eligible for superannuation, can give some service which will be of use to the province, an arrangement is made to that effect. That may be the "skeleton" the hon. member for York South was going to drag from the cabinet. I really trembled when the hon. member made that remark, as I thought he was referring to the judge, and I warned him he should not make references such as that to a Supreme Court judge.

I was the Minister of Mines for a number of years, and I can assure the hon. members there are problems in connection with that work, and one who is on the verge of 80 years of age has

not the capacity of attending to details which some younger men might have, and, as the hon. member for York South has mentioned, the work has piled up in the office. That is quite true.

I suggested to the judge some 5 years ago—and Mr. Jolliffe, who advised you on this matter, knows about this whole situation, and there are others who know about it as well. I suggested, nearly a half-a-dozen years ago, that the judge should retire and take his superannuation, and I would see that he was employed in writing a record of his cases, which might be of some historical, technical or legal value, provided it were approved by the Treasury Board.

At that time, I was the chairman of the Treasury Board, and I could do things at times which I am unable to do now with our present hon. Provincial Treasurer. I told him I would see that his salary was taken care of on a full scale. I thought that was a generous and reasonable proposition, but I was unable to convince the judge. Mr. Jolliffe knows all about that situation. This time, I would make no promises of any kind. One cannot make promises contingent upon the passage of this Act. If the hon. member for York South would withdraw his opposition, if the matter is ever advanced that the judge should spend some of his time in this connection, and it could be shown it was useful to the people of Ontario, the matter could then be considered. I endeavoured to do this at one time, but was unsuccessful. That is all of the story.

MR. MacDONALD: Not all of the story.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question?

HON. MR. FROST: Certainly.

MR. NIXON: Judge Godson is not entitled to superannuation as a federal judge; he has contributed to the superannuation fund of the province, and comes under its regulations?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, that is right.

Section 4 agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On section 8:

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 8, may I point out it states that:

Any proceeding pending in the Mining Court of Ontario when this Act comes into force, shall, if within his jurisdiction, be continued before the mining commissioner.

What is going to happen with cases which are not within his jurisdiction?

HON. MR. FROST: They will be heard by the new judge at Osgoode Hall.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): The Supreme Court will hear such cases.

MR. MacDONALD: No matter what stage of consideration they happen to have reached, they will revert and go to the Supreme Court?

MR. MACAULAY: Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman. They will simply read over the transcript of evidence, and go on from there. What else would the hon. member have them do?

MR. MacDONALD: I am just asking, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MACAULAY: Well, I am telling the hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: Does the government concur in the explanation being given by the hon. member for Riverdale?

HON. MR. FROST: That is a very good answer to your question.

MR. MacDONALD: You do? All right, that is all I wanted to know, Mr. Chairman.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

MR. H. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he is prepared to take the House into his confidence, and say when this Act will be proclaimed, and who the commissioner will be when it is proclaimed?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that we have given any consideration to that. I imagine that the Act would be proclaimed as soon as it conveniently can be done. I think that part of it would depend on the Chief Justice making the necessary arrangement for a judge, naming or nominating one of the judges of the Supreme Court. Then there would be, of course, some other matters, but I assure the hon. member for Brant that it will be done expeditiously and fairly, and that a good appointment will be made, I am sure.

Sections 9 and 10 agreed to.

Bill No. 90 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member for Brant disposed to permit the consideration of the Prime Minister's Estimates?

MR. NIXON: Well, I am at least in the position now where I have them in front of me, which was not the case before.

HON. MR. FROST: Then may I make a motion to that effect?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, when you put the motion originally, I somehow had a lapse of memory. I thought that was the procedure under which the House moved into Committee of Supply and passed a single item to regularize something. When the hon. Prime Minister suggests we move directly into Estimates, I would ask him not to do that now. We did not have the books until a few minutes ago, and it is hardly fair to go directly into Estimates at this time.

HON. MR. FROST: All right, Mr. Chairman, I can only say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that my pur-

pose was not to make it difficult for the Opposition, nor for hon. members of the House, to follow matters but, as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, there is a large volume of detail work to be done, and if we could get the details out of the way, it would give the House that much more time to discuss more important Estimates in greater detail.

I thought the Prime Minister's Estimates would be so little at issue they might have been passed immediately. However, we will leave them for consideration later.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the committee rise and report certain Bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

MR. J. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House reports certain Bills without

amendment, moves the adoption of the report, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will proceed in committee with Bill No. 91, being the Bill in relation to the Gas Pipe Line. Following that we will proceed with the Estimates of the Departments of the Prime Minister, the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the Provincial Auditor, in that order.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:35 of the clock p.m.









ONTARIO

# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Friday, March 2, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Friday, March 2, 1956

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| First report, Standing Committee on Legal Bills, Mr. Beckett .....                                     | 703 |
| First report, Standing Committee on Health, Mr. Dymond .....   | 703 |
| Assessment Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading .....                                    | 704 |
| Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, Bill to amend,<br>Mr. Goodfellow, second reading ..... | 713 |
| Estimates, Department of the Prime Minister, Mr. Frost .....   | 715 |
| Estimates, Office of the Lieutenant-Governor .....   | 715 |
| Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Porter .....   | 715 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 722 |

## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1956

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. H. E. Beckett, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presented the committee's first report and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act.

Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act.

Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Estates Tail Act.

Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Fraudulent Conveyances Act.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Limitations Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend An Act respecting Real Property.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Settled Estates Act.

Your committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(*signed*) H. E. BECKETT,  
*Chairman*

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. M. B. Dymond, from the Standing Committee on Health, presented the committee's first report and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:

Bill No. 95, an Act to regulate the Use of Pesticides.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act.

Your committee begs to report the following Resolution:

*Resolved*, That the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) and those associated with him be commended for the progress they have made in establishing a scientific study of the problem of sex deviation.

(signed) M. B. DYMOND,  
Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Hon. L. M. Frost moves that notwithstanding any application which rules 8, 9 and 14 may have to this motion, any hon. Minister of the Crown when presenting his Estimates to the House may occupy a seat in the front row of the House, and may have his Deputy Minister and one other member of his staff seated in front of, or adjacent to, him, to supply information when required by the Minister.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion is quite familiar to all hon. members of the House. It follows the Ottawa procedure. The technical men formerly sat on one side and in order to answer the innumerable questions which are asked of an hon. Minister, in many cases he had to send notes to them. That took up a great deal of time, and the arrangement we now have seems to be entirely reasonable. We have had it now for very many years.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I wish to table answers to questions 3, 4, 10 and 11.

#### THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. W. A. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 88, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister speaks, is there any urgency in proceeding with this Bill?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it has been called now for the purpose of having it referred to the Committee on Municipal Law. As a matter of fact, this is one of the Bills to which we have referred sometimes as having "no principle." It contains a series of amendments, which really can be more properly discussed in the Committee on Municipal Law and the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that today some 30 hon. members are absent in northern Ontario, visiting one or more of the mines there. I do not want to press forward anything to which anyone has any objection; but I do think this is a matter with which we can proceed.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 88, which is the annual presentation of the amendments to The Assessment Act, I want to assure the hon. members of the House that every opportunity will be given to discuss the individual amendments to The Assessment Act, in the Committee on Municipal Law.

As a matter of fact, that is the reason why I feel it is rather imperative it should be referred to the Committee on Municipal Law as soon as possible, because a little later—perhaps next week—we will introduce the amendments to The Municipal Act, which will give hon. members opportunity, in committee, to deal with the suggested amendments to the two Acts. As the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, these are amendments without principle.

MR. OLIVER: That is worse than the hon. Prime Minister said.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: What is meant is not that we are "unprincipled," and, as far as policy is concerned, as usual, we have very receptive and open minds. These amendments do not



necessarily represent government policy. They are a series of suggested amendments to The Assessment Act which are based on recommendations from the municipalities.

MR. OLIVER: Is that a correct statement? Do they not represent government policy?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Some of them might, later.

MR. OLIVER: You are just trying them out, there?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I might say for the information of the House, there has been a great deal of screening in view of the fact that hundreds of recommendations come to the department each year, requesting amendments to be made. We have screened them down to 28, which we are presenting to the Committee on Municipal Law for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the main amendments to The Assessment Act deal primarily with routine, especially with respect to the procedure in connection with appeals to the Court of Revision. We find that a practice which is increasing every year—and which is permissible under the existing Act—is for appeals from the Court of Revision to be short-circuited directly to the Municipal Board. In view of the fact that certain hon. members of the House may feel that possibly the Municipal Board has too much authority, or perhaps is over-worked—

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: —so therefore, we feel that an opportunity should be given for appeals from assessments to go from the Court of Revision to a county judge, and then to the Municipal Board. One point we did consider was the establishment of fees in connection with appeals to the Municipal Board, but in this province we do not want to deprive anyone of the right to appeal an assessment, whether it is for \$1,000 or \$1 million, because every individual should have the same right.

Therefore, we are suggesting in this amendment that it might be better for all appeals to go from the Court of Revision to the county judge, with the right of final appeal to the Municipal Board.

Perhaps one of the most important sections in these amendments is the one dealing with a fixed assessment on pipe lines in this province. As hon. members of this House are aware, gas and oil have become very important to the future expansion and development of this province. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding between the municipalities and the various companies operating pipe lines in the Province of Ontario, since there was no uniform yardstick, or basis of assessment.

In other words, it is not that the oil companies and the gas companies do not pay their fair share of taxes, when passing through a municipality, but it was felt advisable that some yardstick should be established which would be comparable to what the railway, the telephone and the telegraph companies pay at the present time.

In arriving at this maximum assessment, which has been established in the schedules, there is nothing to prevent a municipality from assessing less than the suggested schedule. We find with the existing pipe lines in the Province of Ontario the municipalities will stand to gain \$208,000. Five municipalities in the province, under this suggested schedule, will lose \$1,640.

Therefore, after a great deal of consultation, and many meetings between the officials of the departments concerned with representatives of the pipe line companies, we arrived at a schedule 20 per cent. above the provincial manual, a figure which we feel is fair, and will protect not only the pipe line companies, but which also will avoid a great deal of misunderstanding. In some cases pipe line companies have found it necessary to retain the services of full-time men who are competent in assessment matters, to deal with the many appeals which they have found it necessary to take, because there was no maximum schedule for assessing pipe lines.

We hope this will clarify the situation in the interests of all parties concerned. We feel we are protecting the municipalities by setting the assessment at 20 per cent. above our own provincial manual.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, what is meant by our "own provincial manual?"

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: The schedule which is set out for pipe lines in the manual. We are raising the figure by 20 per cent. instead of setting a fixed assessment on a foot of pipe basis.

MR. NIXON: What is that in round figures?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I have the schedules here if the hon. member would like me to read them. They are rather long.

MR. NIXON: Does it vary in different municipalities?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No. They are the same in every municipality. The manual is the same for every municipality. I might say pipe lines differ somewhat from railways and the telephone systems, which do interfere with land, but actually pipe line taxes are "found money" for the municipalities. I know that would be the case in my own part of the country where pipe lines, once they have been laid, do not interfere with the cultivation of land, and so on. In view of the fact that municipalities will gain over \$200,000, I feel the pipe line people have been quite reasonable in agreeing to this schedule.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the pipe line figures. The figure for a  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch pipe—the nominal inside diameter—is 7 cents per foot. Then we jump to 36 inches, and it is \$4.72 per foot. I am just seeking information. How was that figure arrived at—by the capacity, the flow of oil through the pipe, or what?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It is based on the value of the pipe.

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with the Bill which is being discussed here, it seems to me there are two places where that Bill can be examined more carefully: firstly, in the Committee on Municipal Law, and, secondly, in the Committee of the Whole House. I think it is hardly desirable to go into the details to the extent hon. members have done at this time. If these schedules are wrong, there will be a great deal of opportunity to discuss them more informally than we can here in the House.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question with regard to the general application. The hon. Minister referred to the municipal manual. Is that the manual which was set up for the operation of the pipe line, or for a provincial assessment?

HON. MR. FROST: That is the assessment manual.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It is only a suggested schedule. In our provincial assessment manual we have a suggested schedule for the assessment of pipe line. Of course it is permissive on the part of the municipality to follow the manual or to assess at any percentage of what the manual suggests. We took the manual which showed what we thought was a fair figure, added 20 per cent. to that, and adopted these schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into detail in discussing the relative merits of the various sizes of pipe. In the Committee on Municipal Law an opportunity will be afforded every hon. member to discuss this matter fully with people who are conversant with it. I admit I do not know anything about the set-up of the schedule, but I do think the pipe line companies in this province should be given a uniform fixed assessment to overcome a great deal of misunderstanding and trouble which exists and which will increase with the development of pipe lines in the Province of Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Minister said previously this had "no principle."

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It definitely has a principle.

HON. MR. FROST: I said the Bill was "without principle."

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: I just repeated what the hon. Prime Minister said. It is not an unprincipled Bill. There are principles involved, and we are leaving them open for discussion.

There is one other matter which I wish to discuss because most of the amendments are routine and will be discussed in the Committee on Municipal Law, individually.

The matter is in connection with an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday in connection with section 28 of the suggested amendments to The Assessment Act, which says in effect that this amendment would repeal any by-laws which have been passed by municipalities in connection with the exemption of properties, or partial exemption of properties, from taxation. This only applies to the City of Toronto and the Town of New Toronto.

In the City of Toronto, I understand, 80 per cent. of the residences are exempt from full taxation under the by-law, which was provided in the City of Toronto Bill. It is on a graded scale and the percentage of exemption increases as you decrease from \$4,000 to \$2,000.

During my predecessor's time the city requested the exemption amount be raised. The request was up to \$6,000, but it was finally set at \$4,400. The hon. Minister must approve any exemptions made on property between \$4,000 and \$4,400, but the city has the right to exempt properties up to \$4,000, which affects 81 per cent. of the residences in this city.

I was led to believe, by certain members of city council when this matter came up for discussion last year, that they would be rather pleased if the government would assume responsibility for repealing their partial exemptions.

But I find, from a discussion which took place in the board of control the day before yesterday, that the city apparently desires to continue the partial exemptions. Far be it from me—or this government—to dictate to any municipality in connection with something which is their own affair. I, therefore, propose in committee to move that this amendment be withdrawn.

I might say for the information of the hon. members of the House that in 1954, upon which the 1955 tax rate was levied in this city, there was a total assessment of \$1,543 million. The partial exemptions to which I referred amounted to \$73 million. In other words, the City of Toronto lost, for general tax purposes, \$73 million due to these graded exemptions.

In that way the City of Toronto lost, because of these exemptions, \$1¼ million of their general tax rate. In addition to that since the Metropolitan rate, which is charged back to the municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto, is based on the total assessment of the municipalities, the 19 per cent. which have no exemption on their properties in the City of Toronto have to make up approximately \$700,000 in their taxes, in order to pay for those who are exempted in their payments to the Metropolitan council.

The City of Toronto, last year, lost through these partial exemptions, \$1,-930,307. I want to point that out to the House. I think it would indicate why certain members of city council indicated earlier to me they would be very pleased if we would assume responsibility for repealing these partial tax exemptions.

However, since the board of control, in its wisdom, has decided that it wishes to continue these exemptions, far be it from us not to accede to its wishes. There is the principle involved that assessment is the whole basis of our municipal taxation, and it might be argued that mill rates should be levied on the total assessment.

It might also be argued that due to partial exemptions, if a residence should



depreciate to a point where it is only worth \$2,000, it would receive a higher percentage of exemption than it would if the assessment was retained at the \$4,000 level. In this city, where they are talking about the clearance of slums, there is a question which might have a retarding effect, inasmuch as there might be places which in the past had been tenant occupied, and the possibilities are that the landlords had been charging rents just about as high as the trade would bear, and, at the same time, had been securing tax exemptions.

MR. J. YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, in reference to the last remarks by the hon. Minister, I was very pleased to hear that in committee stage he would be asking for the deletion of that section, because that has caused some concern to many of the residents of the city, and to many who live in my own particular riding.

I do agree with him, however, that something should be worked out—although I must confess that at the present time I do not know the answer—regarding the benefits that slum housing obtains from this type of by-law.

This matter was highlighted last year in the City of Toronto, when it was brought to the attention of the public as a whole that there were certain homes being used for dwellings, to which the hon. Minister has referred, and which had been allowed to depreciate so much that they received full exemptions. Indeed, it came out that the residents of the City of Toronto were, to some measure, subsidizing this particular type of slum dwelling.

I know it is a very difficult problem to work out. My opinion was that surely this type of legislation was passed primarily to assist the small home owners, and I am sure we are all agreed the small home owners are the ultimate goal a community should have, but, so far as tenant-occupied dwellings are concerned, some measures should be taken to see if a system can be worked out so that the benefits of such a by-law would go to those for whom the benefits were

intended, and not those who would capitalize on the situation of an existing by-law, such as this.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): I would like to make one comment on the by-law. While the hon. Minister says it is really Toronto's own business, and they do not wish to interfere, I think to some extent it is the province's business because surely by lowering this assessment we get to a point where such things as higher education grants may be involved.

HON. MR. FROST: It is not for education.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No, it is not for education.

MR. WHICHER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one other observation about this. When the hon. Minister spoke about a suggested manual which may be used throughout the province, if a municipality is assessed at 100 per cent., that may be cut down to 70 per cent., which is often done throughout the province, in order to secure higher education grants. I would suggest the hon. Minister make such a manual, or a similar one, compulsory to use.

My own particular locality, the County of Bruce, has been re-assessed at 100 per cent. as the manual suggested, and our education grants have been sliced considerably, while another county adjacent to us used the same manual, but brought it down to 70 per cent. and its educational grants are considerably higher. While it is not incorporated in the Bill, I would suggest this manual, or some other, be made compulsory at 100 per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in pretty general agreement with what the hon. member for Bruce said. We discussed this particular problem on numerous occasions. I am glad to hear that Bruce has been assessed 100 per cent., and I am bound to say I do not think the county should suffer by reason of having done that.

There are a number of areas in Ontario—I think one is in the Welland area, and there are others—which have the same situation. We are looking at this carefully to see if there is a way whereby we can not discriminate against them, but give them some encouragement to assess at 100 per cent. We are very much concerned about the problem. I do not know whether there will be any opportunity in the Committee on Municipal Law to discuss a matter of this kind, but it is very interesting.

In relation to the Toronto matter; that, of course, does not affect education. Assessment for education is not involved. It does not affect Metropolitan Toronto, but is a matter of internal arrangement solely.

A private Bill was passed in this House in 1921—the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was then a member of government, but I doubt if he will recall the Bill—

MR. NIXON: I recall the Bill very well, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: That Bill was passed to assist ex-servicemen after the First World War, and the matter has been carried forward for many years, until it has assumed the proportions in which it is today.

Obviously, this amendment will not cure the matter, but I can say, without the shadow of any doubt, that there are many councillors who are worried about this matter, because it has been brought up privately on numerous occasions. Being a matter of internal arrangement within the City of Toronto, affecting only the general tax rate, it is pretty substantially arguable that having been started 35 years ago, under the authority of a private Bill, it is the city's business.

In regard to this matter; I think the entire council feels it is a matter which does affect slum clearance, and has resulted in some undesirable areas remaining in existence which ought to be removed. That point was mentioned by the hon. member for Bellwoods. But, again, that is a matter with which the

city council can deal; they have the power to do it.

I understand the board of control expressed its approval 4 to 1, and I think the thing to do is to leave it with the city council to deal with it. They have a problem they created themselves; they asked for a private Bill 35 years ago, and while it is militating against city development, on the other hand they have all the remedies in their own hands, and I think it is better to leave it right there, and I agree with the hon. Minister that the section should be withdrawn.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might explain how this \$400 occurred, in view of the fact that reference was made to the former Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Toronto was being re-assessed, and it had not been completed and the mayor and board of control appeared in my office and asked that it be permitted for that one year, and gave me their word that the following year it would be submitted to a vote of the people, to see if the people were in favour of the 10 per cent. extra. But the board never had the courage to go to the people of the City of Toronto, and ask what they had promised me they would. Therefore, it was in the Bill as "\$400", and it so remained. When I was the Minister, several times I refused permission for them to carry on, until I had the entire council, or most of them, coming to see me, and, of course, that created a little excitement, and the remark was frequently heard: "Oh, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is dictating to Toronto what it should do."

I was pleased to hear the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs say that this was the last year he would permit the \$400. So far as the \$400 is concerned, only 3 municipalities took advantage of the arrangement, and that was by a vote of the people of the City of Toronto, and that is the only way it should be cancelled, by another vote of the people.

Let them come out and have the courage of their convictions. They came

to me when I was Minister, and said, "Will you please cancel this, or bring it into The Assessment Act?" as they have done with the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Then you hear, in different places: "Oh, that 'Tory' government."

MR. WHICHER: I would like to make one further observation about this, Mr. Speaker, to show how ridiculous it is. Our municipalities have been re-assessed on a 100 per cent. basis. Each municipality within the county has been re-assessed, and the figure has gone to The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Education, and, consequently, our grants have been lowered. This re-assessment does not take effect until 1957, therefore, according to the present law, I believe it would be entirely legal to take 70 per cent. of the total, and get our full education grants back again.

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I might say, as the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, in reply to the hon. member for Bruce, that this is a matter which is giving us a good deal of concern. Re-assessments have been taking place in the province for many years on a progressive basis, using the manual prepared by The Department of Municipal Affairs, which has been set up only as a guide, but it has accomplished a very useful purpose in this province.

I am informed there are only 3 counties which have not adopted a county assessor system, and have completed or are in process of completing a re-assessment. It is true, it may have created some hardship in certain quarters; in other words, some counties have penalized themselves by retaining a 100 per cent. assessment. The question is whether there are enough municipalities in the province which have to re-assess, so that the government might, at this time, set a time limit, next year, or the year after, when there would be an equalized municipal assessment across the province.

We do not like to do things that way, and it has given us a great deal of concern due to the fact that municipalities have penalized themselves, especially in connection with school grants, and we propose next year to continue a provincial assessment for provincial grant purposes. We have considered possibly establishing area offices and placing two competent men in each of these offices, who have had experience in assessing, and for provincial-grant purposes they would spot-check the municipalities, to secure an equalized assessment. We feel it would also encourage the municipalities to adopt an equalized assessment, which would become province wide.

We would much rather have it on a permissive basis and encourage the municipalities to introduce a re-assessment. We feel that would be accomplished best by encouraging them, and having them get away from the penalties for an assessment for provincial grants.

I am told by officials in my department that it is their opinion that, with but a slight increase in staff, they could accomplish that for provincial purposes, for any particular year.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Minister going to have a re-assessment for provincial grant purposes? If so, how will he make it "stick"? Or is it to be only advisory?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No.

MR. OLIVER: What penalty will be applied?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: There will be no penalty. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the provincial grants, we will conduct a re-assessment, and base our grants on the re-assessment, and this we believe will encourage the municipalities to assess on an equalized basis.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Minister going to set up a schedule of assessments for provincial grant purposes?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes.



MR. OLIVER: Supposing a county does not meet the requirements?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: It will not affect them.

MR. OLIVER: Would they not be penalized?

HON. MR. GOODFELLOW: No. Every one would be on the same basis. At the present time, the County of Welland has a re-assessment and are assessing, for all purposes, 100 per cent. The result is they have penalized themselves in regard to school grants, because one of the neighbouring counties has assessed at only 40 per cent. So we have to correct that, by having a re-assessment for provincial grant purposes.

HON. MR. FROST: That will be corrected, in regard to each individual county. A spot-check will be made, and if it is found, generally speaking, they were assessing 40 per cent., we will apply their yardstick, and add another 60 per cent. to it. That is about the only way of which I know by which it can be done. A good deal of work has been done in that regard. As soon as that is done, of course, we can even up the grant schedules, to bring a full measure of justice to those who are assessing 100 per cent. I think that is about the only answer to it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): I agree with the hon. Minister that it is a great problem, and I think, over the years, that The Department of Municipal Affairs has been trying to do a job. I think the hon. Minister hit the nail on the head when he said that while the manual was given out, it is still permissive.

MR. ALLAN GROSSMAN (St. Andrew): I was not going to speak on this Bill at this stage, because I thought perhaps, as a new member, the best way to facilitate the business of the House would be to let the matter go to committee, and argue it there, and perhaps a great deal of discussion would be unnecessary after it had been "kicked around" in committee. But, apparently,

that is not the way it is being done, and I am afraid my silence might be considered as an indication of indifference toward the problem in the City of Toronto.

I think perhaps the hon. Minister and hon. members are inclined to be a little too harsh with the City of Toronto Council. I think it should be remembered that the 1954 council is not the council of 1921. With respect to a promise which might have been made by a council or board of control in one particular year, the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that one council cannot commit a future council. Of course, Mr. Speaker, all governmental bodies have a tendency to tell other governmental bodies to have a great deal of courage in the things on which they legislate.

Actually, if the figures are correct—and no doubt they are—80 per cent. of the residences are now handling some kind of graded exemptions. The problem is not really as crucial as I think some would have you believe, because it means varying expenditure, some of the people who can least afford it are being given graded exemptions, and I do not think the other 19 per cent. or 20 per cent. are complaining too much.

I am one of the 19 per cent. or 20 per cent. and I do not complain too much, in fact, I do not complain at all. Probably most of the complaints come from the large property owners, and, Mr. Speaker, there is no use looking for perfect justice, because there is no such thing in any kind of taxation. Certainly everybody does not pay the same income tax, they pay income tax according to what the government thinks they can afford.

As far as its effect on property and the deterioration of property, I think most of the homes which are suffering from deterioration would be those which are tenant-occupied, and if the solution, or an alleviation lies anywhere, it would be that graded exemptions should be granted only to those homes which are owner-occupied.

That is what I was going to bring out at the committee level, and I think, to

some extent, that would help the situation. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the problem is going to go on too long anyway, and in a few years from now, if, as and when we have an amalgamated Metropolitan territory, the problem will solve itself.

MR. R. J. BOYER (Muskoka) : Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing of the situation in cities and in counties—may I refer to the situation in districts? There of course is not the opportunity for a district assessment to be made except by going through a rather involved procedure to have a district assessor appointed.

There are several municipalities which, taken singly, are having their educational grants reduced by reason of the fact that they have assessed according to the manual. I say it is welcome news, to hear the statements by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs on this problem, that it is being looked at with a view to improving that situation. I was wondering if the hon. Minister might care to say something about the situation in districts, in contrast to the counties? I would say that we certainly would welcome some different arrangement which would assist municipalities in the districts.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) : Mr. Speaker, in relation to the discussion on Toronto, this matter primarily goes back to the old private Bill of 1921 which I think contained a ceiling figure of \$4,000. Subsequently, some 2 or 3 years ago, there was the Bill mentioned by the hon. Provincial Secretary which increased the amount by \$400 as a temporary expedient to meet the requirement of that year. My recollection of the Bill is it was necessary to give discretion to the hon. Minister for a period of a year, in order to enable them to have a vote.

Since that time, no action has been taken, and the hon. Minister is faced with still giving consent for the \$400 exemptions. We are going to give consideration to removing the necessity for

obtaining the hon. Minister's consent entirely, and leave it entirely up to the city council to determine, because that is where it ought to be, instead of coming here every year asking us to give consent to these \$400 exemptions, I think it ought to be left with the city council to determine it themselves. We will take that action, probably in a few days.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches) : Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to prolong the debate, but I am the one responsible for the \$400 exemption which was won when the partial exemption by-law was passed. It was passed to help persons with the smaller homes especially in the surroundings which were then the suburban part of Toronto, and it was a time when they were developing as far as roads, sidewalks and sewers are concerned. In the City of Toronto, they built a permanent roadway, which was expensive, and at that time the cost of some of the local improvements on a certain parcel of property was greater than the tax rate, the general rate and the school tax, so it was done at that time to help alleviate these areas in which heavy local improvements were being made.

As time went on, they forgot all about the partial exemption, which was carried on until the time of the re-assessment. In re-assessment, these graded properties assessed up to \$2,000 on buildings were granted an exemption of 50 per cent., and then they dropped from 50 per cent. to 10 per cent., at the time of re-assessment. When it reached the \$4,000 bracket, it has taken thousands of homes out of the partial-exemption class.

My argument at that time was this: the principle of partial exemption was right and proper, it should have been graded to take care of those who were receiving the partial exemption, and it was carried out. But we had to secure the permission of the hon. Minister to carry it for a year, when it was raised above what the people had voted on. There was a distinct understanding that the matter would be taken to the people, but succeeding boards of control always

came to the hon. Minister for approval the following year, saying they would take it to the people the following election, but it was never done. That is the situation on the partial exemption.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

## MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. Goodfellow moves second reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953."

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I explained at the time I introduced the amendments to the House, after two years' experience in the operation of Metropolitan Toronto—this new municipality which was formed in 1953—we tried to co-ordinate and solve some of the problems which had arisen over the years, and which have become very acute. It is now thought necessary that certain amendments should be made to The Metropolitan Toronto Act.

As I explained when introducing the Bill, these suggested amendments arose from requests from the Metropolitan council itself, and we feel they are in the best position to give the matter study. I have discussed this with most of the members in the area concerned, and we are presenting these amendments at this time for consideration by the House.

Since these amendments are all concerned primarily with the Toronto-York area, it is not proposed they should be referred to the Committee on Municipal Law, but could be discussed individually in full at the time the Bill is before the House in Committee.

Possibly I should give some explanation at this time, since this Bill will not be referred to the Committee on Municipal Law. The first amendment provides for a two-year mandatory council for all the municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto. It is felt, in the interests of the area as a whole, and in view of the fact that practically all the municipalities

have a two-year term—including the City of Toronto which has voted and has passed on a two-year term, taking effect in 1957—that it was in the interest of the area as a whole to have a mandatory two-year term for the council.

It so happens in connection with the two-year terms which are in effect, or are coming into effect, each one of them would have had an election in December of this year anyway, so it does not disturb the existing municipal set-up by the provision for a two-year term.

We provide here for a nomination date to be set for all the municipalities in November. This provides for the setting of hours for the poll between 10 a.m. and 8 p.m. on election day, and it provides that election day shall be on the second Monday in December. A good deal of discussion has taken place on this point, and we would be guided by what would appear to be the wishes of the majority of the people concerned in this area.

I think it is felt that the "lame duck" council should operate for as short a period as possible, yet we do not want to force on the Metropolitan municipalities an election date which is going to interfere with their Christmas festivities, so we decided on that date. But, as I say, it is open for discussion.

There are a number of minor amendments which I do not feel it is necessary for me to discuss with the House today. Certain things which were given at the time Metro was formed are being carried out in these amendments. We provide for Metro to have powers which the individual municipalities have at the present time, and which it has been found necessary—at least in the opinion of Metropolitan Toronto—that they should have.

We are providing for Metro to make a grant to cover a deficit which has accrued to the Toronto Transit Commission from last year's operations. This was at the request of Metro council. We have provided for the Metropolitan council to make payments to the Toronto Transit Commission in respect to



the cost of transporting blind and disabled persons, similar to the power which the City of Toronto now has. We provide, in this amendment, after discussing it with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop)—possibly he might like to explain this section in connection with the appointment of the members of the Metropolitan School Board, where changes are to be made. There is also one amendment, in connection with the transporting of school pupils, with which the hon. Minister of Education is familiar.

We also make it possible for Metro to be responsible for the burial of dead persons, because the council feels it wants that. That is under The Anatomy Act, to take care of indigents who have become the responsibility of the Metropolitan municipality, and we felt it was important that we should give them this authority so there would be no misunderstanding.

There is a section here which transfers the Toronto Isolation Hospital, commonly known as "Riverdale Hospital," to Metropolitan Toronto, inasmuch as it serves the whole area, and not merely the municipality of Toronto proper.

This authorizes the Metropolitan Corporation to acquire certain lands and premises from the Canadian Institute for the Blind, to be used for the purposes of looking after retarded children. A section here permits the Metropolitan Corporation to buy land for a site for the erection of a courthouse. It makes provision for the unification of the police forces of all the Metropolitan municipalities. After a good deal of consideration, it has been decided the police commission should be composed of 5 members, and provision is made for the constitution of this commission to be the chairman of Metro council, a member of Metro council appointed by council, a judge, and two magistrates. We feel in the interests of the people, and in view of the large undertakings which this commission will be assuming, it is desirable to have a 5-man board.

It is also proposed that the Metropolitan Corporation will have full re-

sponsibility for the administration of justice within the municipality itself.

In other words, the magistrates' courts will become the responsibility of Metro council. In order to have uniformity, we are providing that the Metropolitan suburban municipalities, which at the present time are more or less directly under The Department of the Attorney-General, will be transferred to the Metropolitan Corporation, and they will be collecting fees in a way similar to that by which they are collected by the City of Toronto at the present time.

By amendment No. 18, we are making provision for the establishment of a separate licencing commission. It is felt desirable that the licencing in this area should be separated from the police commission.

The Metro licencing commission will be composed of 3 members. There will be the chairman of Metropolitan council, or his nominee. If it is found impossible for the chairman to be present, he may delegate some member of the Metropolitan council to represent him at the meeting. There will also be two magistrates.

It is proposed that all licencing of a Metropolitan nature, in regard to trades such as carters, taxicabs, auctioneers, electricians, etc., who operate within the whole area, should be licenced by the Metropolitan licencing board.

Provision is made for the councils of the individual municipalities to appoint a committee to deal with those matters of licencing which would appear to be local in nature.

We also make provision for the Metropolitan council to acquire land and establish zoological gardens. Hon. members will recall that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) yesterday in his Budget made provision for \$100,000 to establish and improve zoological gardens in this area. I presume we will have no trouble in finding specimens to put in the gardens once they are improved and accommodations are available. We also make provision for Metropolitan council to take over Riverdale

Zoo, and to assume any outstanding debentures.

Provision is made also to transfer Toronto Island to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Corporation. We feel that the Metropolitan council was wise in its decision to ask for this amendment. In view of the natural playground in this area, it would be in a much better position to develop its potentialities than any individual municipality.

We also make provision for the Metropolitan council to acquire land for garbage disposal and to regulate the dumping and disposal of garbage.

We make provision for Metropolitan council to make annual grants to worthy associations engaged in welfare and other types of work.

Mr. Speaker, those are the main amendments which are presented to the House in this Bill. I do not propose to discuss some of the recommendations which were made, but which we did not feel were advisable to bring forward at this time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. J. F. Edwards in the chair.

#### ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PRIME MINISTER

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, it is the custom for each Minister to make a speech when presenting the Estimates for his department. I do not propose to do that this afternoon. I merely wish to say that in The Prime Minister's Department we always endeavour to be of service to people. We receive them well. I endeavour to receive everybody.

At times, people have to wait and so we have provided, as you will note in one of the items of the Estimates, for reading matter for people while they are waiting. That is all part of the policy

of being reasonable and helpful to people. There are many problems they ask to submit to the government, and our facilities are always available to hear them.

One of the things which we did last year, as on previous occasions, was to send about 2½ million cigarettes to some 44,000 of the personnel of our Armed Forces in this country and overseas, at a cost of \$10,500. Letters of appreciation have been received from all over the world, Indo-China, Germany, France, Holland, England, Scotland, Japan and other places. These cigarettes were sent from the people of Ontario at the Christmas season.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say about the functions of this department which, as you know, is one of the minor departments of government. We do a great deal with very little money.

Vote 1,401 agreed to.

Vote 1,402 agreed to.

#### ESTIMATES, OFFICE OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

Vote 1,001 agreed to.

#### ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

On Vote 2,101.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I presume that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) has read the provincial auditor's report in reference to the Public Service Superannuation Fund. I do not wish to read this at length, but I would point out that on page 16, the provincial auditor said:

While this condition exists, the deficits in the funds will continue to increase. A study of the present basis of making contributions to the fund should be undertaken without delay. This recommendation has been made in previous reports and no action has been taken. The present practice relieves the expenditure of the current fiscal year at the expense of the expenditures of future fiscal years.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that is the kernel of the whole criticism. If enough money is not being contributed by the government to the Public Service Superannuation Fund, and the amount will have to be made up in succeeding years, it seems to me what the provincial auditor means is that the government is not contributing as much as it should at the present time, and will have to make additional contributions to the fund in future years in order to make up the deficiency. The auditor concludes this paragraph by saying:

As in previous reports, I strongly recommend that the province adopt and put into effect the principle of providing in full for superannuation benefits in the year in which the qualifying service is rendered.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer will agree that the provincial auditor was extremely critical of the manner in which the government was making its contributions to the Teachers' Superannuation Fund and the Public Service Superannuation Fund. I think his comments in connection therewith deserve some detailed explanation on the part of the hon. Provincial Treasurer as to the kind of "mess" we are getting into with regard to these funds and the contributions to them.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, an additional \$1 million was provided by Supplementary Estimate last year, and again this year, which improves the situation. I understand that in a year's time Prof. Sheppard, the actuary, will be making another revaluation of the fund.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, what has the hon. Provincial Treasurer to say about a portion of the preceding paragraph, which says:

The valuation balance sheet of the fund shows a deficiency of \$46,220,000 as at March 31, 1952.

That is either right or wrong. What is the explanation?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, with the addition of the \$1 million put in over and above the annual regular contributions, that deficiency will be substantially made up. The whole matter is reviewed by the actuary from time to time and within a few months we may have a much more complete picture of the situation.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that nobody would cross the provincial auditor, nor say he is wrong.

MR. OLIVER: No one would dare.

HON. MR. FROST: What he says is substantially correct. My recollection of the Superannuation Fund is that it is increasing each year and will increase probably for the next 20 years, when it will have reached its peak. At the end of that time, it probably will begin to drop.

I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that if this government is in office at that time, we will see that the upward trend is continued, and is not allowed to drop.

At the present time, there is undoubtedly an actuarial deficit. That occurred in preceding years, probably going back 50 years. I have no doubt that it continued during the time the hon. members opposite were in office, as they were not very generous with the fund. Probably during that period it accumulated some of this actuarial deficit.

MR. OLIVER: The provincial auditor does not think the hon. Prime Minister and his government are generous enough now.

HON. MR. FROST: That may be so, but nevertheless we are generous. In the last few years an extra \$1 million has been put into the fund. In the last 10 years, the government has subsidized this fund by an increased rate of interest. I think we are paying at the present time 5 per cent. If the fund was investing its money in securities of this and other governments, the rate would be around



3 per cent.; so we are subsidizing it, not only to the extent of an extra \$1 million, but also by a purely artificial interest rate of 5 per cent., to help things along.

I suppose the real answer to the question is to adjust the contributions of the employees, and probably also the government's contribution. I imagine it would not cost the government any more than it is at the present time, but it would put the fund in an actuarial position where it would meet the criticism of auditors and actuaries in years to come.

MR. OLIVER: I do not wish to pursue the point. In the third last paragraph on page 16, the auditor states—

HON. MR. FROST: That is unassailable. That is actuarially right.

MR. OLIVER: I think it is unassailable. The report says:

The actuary states that this deficit is increasing by more than \$2 million each year. This means that the assets and receipts of the fund are insufficient to provide for the contemplated superannuation benefits and the insufficiency is increasing each year.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer says—and the hon. Prime Minister reiterates—that by paying in \$1 million this year, and \$1 million last year, it will be all right. But the actuary says that in spite of these added contributions on the part of the government, the fund is growing worse by \$2 million every year. Even if the government is paying in \$1 million, you cannot balance the fund in that way.

HON. MR. FROST: As the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said, Prof. Sheppard is looking after it. We will try to bring it into line with the proper requirements. To some extent, we are engaging in a matter which is theory. I do not know whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer would agree with that or not.

As a matter of fact, the Superannuation Fund of the civil service is really backed by the entire resources of

Ontario, and by the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The money from the Superannuation Fund is invested in our own securities and to that extent, the deficit there is theoretical.

If we had no fund at all and paid the superannuation benefits out of current revenue, I suppose that is the situation which would be reached about 1990, probably not that soon. It would probably take until about the year 2050, before there would be no money in the fund. Then the people of that day—if we are not destroyed by an atomic bomb in the meantime—would be faced with meeting the deficit out of current revenue.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister says that if we had no fund, it would be all right. That is all right for the sake of argument. But we have a fund, and it is especially stipulated that the fund shall be created and shall be kept solvent.

I think the main point of criticism is that we are falling behind year after year in these payments, and when we actually get to the place where these payments are on a par with what they should be, we will have to make a sizeable contribution, not \$1 million but \$8 million or \$10 million.

It is most unfair to run short in your contributions for a number of years, only to find that the cumulative obligation of the government may amount to 6 or 7 times what they have been putting in for a number of years. That is the point.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Prime Minister agree that a realistic approach would be an adjustment of the contributions?

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. That is what Prof. Sheppard is considering.

MR. OLIVER: How long has he been looking at it?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not know. Sometimes these things take a considerable time. Actuaries take a long time.

The contributions at the present time are 4 per cent. up to a certain level, and 6 per cent. above that. I understand if it were all levelled off at 6 per cent., the deficits would cease to occur.

MR. OLIVER: It would be stabilized, but you cannot avoid making up the backlog.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, if the backlog did not increase, it would not amount to anything for about 200 years. I do not know that any government should be asked to put up, say, \$50 million. After all, it has our guarantee. What more could be required?

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I can understand why the hon. member is so interested in the year 1990. He hopes to win an election in that year.

MR. OLIVER: I wonder if it is thought the civil servants and the teachers are going to live for a couple of hundred years?

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if he would mind explaining the "Net Public Debt, \$40,680,000." I realize the debt is very large. Does that include Hydro bonds?

HON. MR. PORTER: No, this is the provincial debt only.

MR. WHICHER: It does not include Hydro bonds? For example, when we finance the Hydro are they Ontario bonds or are they Hydro bonds?

HON. MR. PORTER: I should perhaps make clear the position. Perhaps I have not made it quite clear. To the extent of \$250 million we financed in New York for the Hydro, with Ontario bonds, the Ontario Government issues the bonds, and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission is not a party to them. We do not pay the interest on the bonds which is included in this \$40 million figure. But we are reimbursed by the Hydro.

MR. WHICHER: I thought that was a little high.

HON. MR. PORTER: I think perhaps that answers the hon. member.

MR. WHICHER: That is right. The next thing is, "Sinking Fund Installments, \$17,729,000." How do you arrive at that figure? Do we pay so much off the debt over the years as in municipal governing, or how is that figure arrived at?

HON. MR. PORTER: There are certain bonds which have attached to them certain sinking fund conditions. In other words, there is a contractual obligation contained in the bonds themselves to set aside a certain amount of money per year for that particular issue.

The instalment, series "AM—as it is called—\$1,033,000" is set aside under that bond contract. Another series "AM, \$1,196,000" is set aside for those specific bonds. Then there is a large payment out of the sinking fund amounting to \$15,500,000 making a total of \$17,779,000.

MR. OLIVER: Is that statutory?

HON. MR. PORTER: No, it is provided for in the Statute, but the Statute does not provide for any definite amount to be set aside every year. The Statute provides for sinking fund payments in a general way. The general sinking fund payments are really determined as a matter of judgment. They are arbitrary amounts which are fixed by the Provincial Treasurer from year to year.

MR. OLIVER: Is there a minimum amount?

HON. MR. PORTER: There is no minimum amount. If we look back over last year, the sinking fund payment was \$17,630,000, that is, 1955-56. In 1954-55, it was \$21,536,000. It has varied somewhat from year to year, the purpose being to set aside what appears to be a reasonable amount each year for debt retirement, and as bonds become

due there is a sufficient amount in the sinking fund from which they can be paid off.

Sometimes it appears to be good business if provincial securities are on the market, and the price is perhaps lower than par, to buy them in. In the sinking fund there are always a certain amount of Dominion bonds which are being held as securities, which will be available at the time our debts are to be matured. The full particulars of the sinking fund can be found in the "Public Accounts," page 50. That is the general principle adopted.

MR. WHICHER: That explanation certainly enlightens me a great deal. In municipal financing, supposing a high school was to be built, we might finance it over a 20-year period. Is provincial financing not done that way? Do you just pay what you can afford each year? There would come a time when, if everything went along well, and we did not borrow any more, this debt would be paid off entirely?

HON. MR. PORTER: If we did not have to borrow any more money in the next 20 years, I imagine by that time—I do not know in how many years—this sinking fund would pay it all off. But at a certain period these sinking fund payments would accumulate and be sufficient to pay off all the debt existing at the present time.

MR. WHICHER: In municipal financing, of course, there is a certain definite period.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. WHICHER: But in provincial financing there is no definite period?

HON. MR. PORTER: No. The arbitrary amount is set and it is a matter of judgment from time to time.

HON. MR. FROST: It is not the same question. We have in the last 12 years been able to pay off about 60 per cent. of our capital investment—that is, on highways and so forth—from current revenue. These sinking fund payments

go against that. Of course, our position is, roughly, if we levied taxes to pay off all our capital debt, it would seem like pretty hard lines for the people who are living today. However, we are faced with the problem on the opposite end, that our requirements are so great we have to make very great extensions to our capital works, buildings, roads, and rural expansions—which we have been subsidizing to the extent of about \$10 million a year—that the residue of 40 per cent. amounts to a very considerable item.

I notice that a statement was made in one of the newspapers today that the net debt had increased by \$200 million over the last 12 years. That is true. On the other hand it must be remembered that we have against this, from a standpoint of credit, the fact that our revenues have expanded about 4 times. In other words, about 12 years ago the debt was \$500 million. The revenues at that time were \$100 million. Today, the debt is about \$700 million but the revenue is \$500 million, so that in ratio to revenue where it was 5 to 1 before, it is less than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 now.

Of course those factors would take into effect the fact that the dollar has increased in value, and so on.

In relation to the ratio of revenues to debt, our position is now quite different, and very much better, but still it is a problem to keep it down. Even paying 60 per cent. of capital investment from ordinary revenues as we have been doing—and we have been able to carry that out, on the average, over the last 12 years—there is still a significant addition to the debt, and unless there is an offsetting revenue increase, the expansion of the debt of the province might at some time overtake it.

We were in the position in the 1930's where our debt position was overtaking us because of the fall-off of revenue. That is a difficult problem. The problem is increased by the fact that, if you put it on a strictly scientific basis of amortization over a period of 20 years, then the debt goes up so much. On the other hand, if you pay it all out of taxes, it is a burden on the people who are



living today. We have been trying to strike an in-between position, and we have been able to do it on a 60-40 basis.

MR. OLIVER: On that point, I was under the impression—apparently erroneously—that there was a minimum requirement into the sinking fund. If there is not I seriously think there should be. I can understand the vagaries of what your income will be. It fluctuates from time to time, but I think there should be an obligation upon the government to put a minimum requirement in the sinking fund each year. The way it is now, you might go along for two or three years and hit a bad time, and throw it away out of the road. I know that is a good place for it.

It seems to me it would be more systematic if there would be a sense of uniformity to it, if each year you were required to put in \$17 million, or \$15 million, which would be put in each year, not an amount that is going to cripple you financially, but some amount which will be put in from year to year, one year after another. There would be more sense to that, than the way it is being done at the present time.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. Prime Minister reminds me the Hepburn government abandoned sinking funds at one time. The hon. leader of the Opposition must remember that.

MR. OLIVER: This government has almost abandoned them.

HON. MR. PORTER: They abandoned nearly everything. They just about abandoned Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: The present government did.

MR. WHICHER: That is not fair, Mr. Chairman. The point is if he abandoned them, I am against it. I certainly say that, and I think it would be a good thing to have a minimum.

HON. MR. FROST: The government of those days ran into shortages of funds and other difficulties. I used to be the Opposition critic.

MR. OLIVER: We inherited that.

HON. MR. PORTER: It was a long chain of inheritances.

HON. MR. FROST: But that government faced shortage of revenues for some years, and abandoned the sinking fund requirements. I think they were right in doing so. I agree for the reason that if you did not do that, you would have to pay it off, and borrow money again.

HON. MR. PORTER: Borrow money to pay the sinking fund.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not disagree with that. I thought it was reasonable.

MR. OLIVER: Of course, the financial conditions prevailing then were altogether different than those prevalent at the moment. There is no reason why, if we were to get systematic financing, the funds could not be paid off in a certain amount from year to year.

HON. MR. PORTER: If it were statutory, and you ran into a period similar to the one to which you have reference, in order to meet the sinking fund, you would have to go out and borrow money at a time when it would be difficult to borrow to meet the sinking fund payments. In government financing you must have some flexibility, otherwise your hands are tied by some Statute, and it might end up in a number of onerous bargains in which the government would be involved, in order to meet the terms of a rigid statutory provision.

HON. MR. FROST: The best way not to run into that situation is to keep us in office.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is quite idle to talk about any sinking fund payment, unless there is a surplus of revenue out of which it can be paid.

MR. WHICHER: Surely a huge municipality like Metropolitan Toronto handles huge sums of money. They have to pay off so much of their bonds every year.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: They created a sinking fund last year for that purpose.

HON. MR. PORTER: They added to the assessment and spread out. The revenues of the Provincial Government are more sensitive to bad times.

MR. WHICHER: It seems to me they are sensitive to the Party which happens to be in power. You mentioned the Hepburn government not paying it off, but I think they should. I suggest some government—not your government, perhaps, but some other government—might take advantage of the situation, and instead of paying off \$17 million, it might throw it around in the form of a “slush fund,” just before an election or in the form of a trust fund or something. I would not suggest you would, but some other government might.

HON. MR. PORTER: Any unconditional grants we have paid have been over and above the sinking fund provisions.

MR. WHICHER: The hon. Provincial Treasurer said there is no provision necessary.

HON. MR. PORTER: Provisions have been made for the sinking fund.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, just before we pass to item 2,101, the hon. members may recall several years ago that the late “Bob” Saunders and some friends organized a group here in Toronto called the “Canadian Olympic Training Plan” and the purpose of that organization was to promote—

HON. MR. FROST: I think that will come up later. I do not think it comes in here, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is not in the Estimates of this Department.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I might tell you that I had a letter yesterday saying that they are to meet in Hamilton, and

are going to make a request for \$2,000. I referred the writer to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, because it was a grant which was not for entertainment.

MR. COWLING: Under the general item of 2,101 I wanted to make reference to the Olympic Training Scheme that is set up now, and for the Olympics in Australia next year.

HON. MR. PORTER: I think it is under “Athletics, \$20,000.”

MR. COWLING: We will take it up later.

Vote 2,101 agreed to.

On Vote 2,102:

MR. OLIVER: “Salaries, \$1,100,000”; do all the civil servants receive their salaries from this item?

HON. MR. PORTER: The staff of the comptroller of revenue consists of 314 members, as of March 1, 1956, in the various branches of the activities of that department. The Corporation Tax Branch has a skeleton staff, because we have not been collecting that tax latterly, but we may be shortly.

MR. OLIVER: Is the number of the staff opposite the figures?

HON. MR. PORTER: No, it has not been broken down as to how many are in each of the branches. “Succession duty” and “gasoline tax” were formerly collected through The Department of Highways. It created a substantial operation, in addition to this item, by moving from one department to another. That is a new item this current year. Actually, the yearly salaries of the staff of 314, as of March 1, 1956, is \$996,785. Allowance for salary increases and additional staff, which we contemplate may be necessary, if we have to collect the corporation tax again, would require an additional \$103,215, or a total of \$1,100,000.

Votes 2,102 to 2,106 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 2,107:

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. Minister know how much money the province spent under The Housing Development Act?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. This item, "Housing Corporation Limited" was for the purpose of facilitating the purchase of new, low-cost housing, by advancing monies under second mortgages, which was established in 1948. From May, 1948, to December, 1949, second-mortgage monies were advanced by this corporation. Then the Government of Canada extended its facilities, and took over that field. The total applications received and approved were 14,695; the total amount advanced, \$16,600,000. The amount outstanding today is \$7,669,000, a very large reduction. A great many of them have been paid off.

I remember very well when that Bill was proceeding through the House, some of the hon. members of the Opposition were sure we would not be getting our money back, that the people would be so burdened by this additional credit that they would never get out from under it. All that is outstanding, in the year 1956—not a very long time for paying back second mortgages—is only \$7,669,000. The rate of interest was 3½ per cent. and the total number

of loans repaid in full was 5,597 and the total number of loans outstanding is 9,098. The amount lost to date is \$286.

Vote 2,107 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, moves the adoption of the report, and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: On Monday, Mr. Speaker, we will consider the Estimates of The Department of Agriculture. Failing that, the next in order would be The Department of the Provincial Secretary, but we plan to go ahead with The Department of Agriculture on Monday, and then in committee on Bill No. 91, that is the Pipe Line Bill, and there may be other matters on the Order paper, which may be considered.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.00 of the clock, p.m.









# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Monday, March 5, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956





## CONTENTS

---

Monday, March 5, 1956

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Report, commissioners of estate Bills .....  | 725 |
| Second report, Standing Committee on Conservation, Mr. Stewart .....   | 725 |
| Presenting report, Mr. Dunbar .....  | 726 |
| Hospital Services Commission of Ontario, Bill to establish, Mr. Frost, first reading .....                                       | 726 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 729 |
| Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada<br>Pipe Line, Bill to facilitate, reported ..... | 729 |
| County Court Judges Criminal Courts Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 731 |
| Crown Witnesses Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 731 |
| Magistrates Jurisdiction Act, Bill to repeal, reported .....   | 731 |
| Limited Partnerships Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 731 |
| Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 732 |
| Summary Convictions Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 732 |
| Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 732 |
| Estates Tail Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 732 |
| Fraudulent Conveyances Act, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 732 |
| Limitations Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 732 |
| Act respecting Real Property, Bill to amend, reported .....  | 732 |
| Settled Estates Act, Bill to amend, reported .....   | 732 |
| Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary, Mr. Dunbar .....  | 732 |
| Estimates, Office of Provincial Auditor .....  | 753 |
| Estimates, Department of Insurance, Mr. Roberts .....  | 753 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....  | 754 |

# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the commissioners of estate Bills their report in the following Bill:

March 1, 1956.

Roderick G. Lewis, Esq.,  
Clerk,  
Legislative Assembly,  
Parliament Buildings,  
TORONTO, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Lewis:

Further to my letter to you of February 13, I now forward herewith report, in duplicate, of the hon. Mr. Justice Roach and the hon. Mr. Justice Gibson as commissioners of estate Bills with respect to Bill No. 1, being an Act respecting the City of Chatham.

Yours very truly,

(signed) J. W. PICKUP

## IN THE MATTER OF A BILL ENTITLED:

## AN ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF CHATHAM

The undersigned judges of The Supreme Court of Ontario, as commissioners of estate Bills to whom a petition and Bill in respect to the City of Chatham relating to lands comprised in Victoria Park, in the said City of Chatham, has been referred, report as follows:

In our opinion,

- (1) It is reasonable that this Bill do pass into law.
- (2) The provisions thereof are proper for carrying its purposes into effect.

The Bill, duly signed by us, and the petition, are both attached hereto.

Dated this first day of March, A.D. 1956.

(signed) W. D. ROACH  
Commissioner.

(signed) COLIN GIBSON  
Commissioner.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. W. J. Stewart from the Standing Committee on Conservation presented the committee's second report and moves its adoption.

Your committee met today at 10 a.m. and passed the following resolutions:

That the hon. Minister of Mines be requested to meet all parties affected by the question of gravel removal and erosion on Lake Erie between Point Pelee and Rondeau Channel and study what relief might be arrived at under the jurisdiction of The Beach Protection Act.

That there should be close co-operation between the Parks Division of The Department of Lands and Forests, any provincial parks authority that may be established, the Water Resources Commission and the various river authorities in the province to avoid duplicate endeavour and to take advantage of all opportunities of developing parks.

That The Department of Lands and Forests be commended for action to date on conservation education and that the hon. Ministers of Lands and Forests, Education, Agriculture and Planning and Development be urged to meet and study what efforts might be taken to intensify conservation education among youth.

That The Department of Lands and Forests be requested to do everything possible to scatter nectar-bearing trees

through planting and reforestation projects to insure a balance of bees and that The Department of Highways follow the same policy in roadside planting.

That The Department of Lands and Forests be commended for the use made to date of reform institutions populations and that they be urged to use inmates to the full in planting and reforestation projects.

(signed) W. J. STEWART,  
*Chairman.*

Report agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for the year ended June 30, 1955.

HON. J. N. ALLAN (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that our department's Motor Vehicles Branch will introduce the written test and vision test for applicants for driver's licences beginning on Wednesday morning next. The office, which is on the corner of Sussex St. and Spadina, will be open between 5 and 6 tomorrow afternoon, and we would welcome a visit from any of the Toronto hon. members who may find it convenient to look over our premises and view the tests.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, one would draw from the hon. Minister's remarks that these applications are to be written by every applicant for a motor vehicle licence. Does he refer to those who already hold permits, or just to those who are applying for the first time?

HON. MR. ALLAN: To those who are applying for the first time.

MR. OLIVER: That was not clear from the remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to welcome to this Assembly students from Lillian Street School, Willowdale; Riverside and Forest Avenue Schools, Port Credit, and also a group from the Toronto Teachers' College.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, might I ask you to revert to "Introduction of Bills"?

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

### HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Hon. Mr. Frost moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Hospital Services Commission of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: The purposes of this Bill are, of course, set out in the Bill itself, particularly in sections 7 and 8. The purpose is to develop and ensure the continuance of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals in Ontario, with related hospital facilities.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the prominence given to the matter of hospital insurance, may I say that sections 7 (d) and 8(e) provide the power to administer any system of hospital-care insurance, and also to establish a division of hospital care insurance. These powers, among many others, are contained in the Bill.

This Bill permits a very great strengthening of our hospital system, whether or not there is hospital insurance in Ontario. The representatives of the Hospital Association have been consulted on a number of occasions in reference to the terms of this Bill.

With reference to sections 7(d) and 8(e); for upwards of two years now, we have been conducting an intensive study of hospital care insurance.

There has been a very great deal said about this Bill, in the Press and elsewhere. While this Bill is designed



to permit the administration of a hospital insurance plan, it must, by no means, be taken as a commitment that there will be such a plan.

This Bill lays very important foundations, but it is not a commitment as far as the province is concerned. I want it to be understood that it has been purposely designed in that way. Mr. Speaker, I propose to give the most complete information available to date on the subject of hospital insurance on second reading, which I propose shall be considered day after tomorrow, that is, on Wednesday afternoon.

In that connection may I read the relevant paragraph as contained in the Speech from the Throne:

Progress towards the adoption of a national plan of hospital services was given a strong impetus when the Government of Ontario submitted its proposals to the Federal-Provincial Conference in April last and further amplified them at the conference in October. As a result of Ontario's efforts, health insurance was not only placed on the conference agenda, but a special committee was established to study Ontario's, and other provinces' and the Federal Government's proposals.

This committee met in October and again last week. In consequence, more progress has been made on hospital insurance in the past year than in all the previous decades that this subject has been under consideration. The proposals made by Ontario and those received from the Federal Government will be placed before the Standing Committee on Health where they may be examined in detail and later presented to the members of this House for their fullest consideration.

Any insurance plan must be built upon hospital services and administration. That is the foundation. Any structure to be built will be only as secure as the foundations. This Bill, whether or not there is hospital insurance, will contribute very greatly to the development of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals.

I propose this Bill be debated on second reading on Wednesday, and then referred to the Committee on Health. On both occasions, namely, on second reading, and in the Committee on Health, the most complete information in relation to hospital insurance to date will be given.

I think, due to the intervention of the Federal-Provincial Conference on Friday, probably a week from Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday mornings could be devoted to the study of this matter in the Committee on Health. That is, second reading being given on Wednesday of this week, and then the following Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday mornings devoted to discussions in the Committee on Health. I propose, on Wednesday, to give the most complete information to the House as to the type of information, and a suggested agenda which may be submitted to the Committee on Health.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? Will this commission be charged with the responsibility of examining proposed hospitalization schemes, and reporting back to the government?

HON. MR. FROST: Not necessarily. On the other hand, I will be quite frank in saying I think this commission might serve a useful purpose in that regard. We have given consideration to that. I do not think the Bill, as such, provides further than that the commission would administer a hospital insurance plan, as might be directed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition can realize that this House could not delegate the bringing in of a hospital insurance plan to a commission. That would have to be predicated upon an Act of this Legislature. The Order-in-Council directed to the commission would be in pursuance of a Bill which would be brought in, dealing with the matter of hospital insurance in Ontario.

MR. OLIVER: I have one other question relating to the suggestion that the Committee on Health examine the

information which they are given. On a previous occasion, I understood the hon. Prime Minister to say this committee would have before it, for its examination a federal plan as well as the provincial plan.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: There is a provincial plan, and the committee will have a chance to see it?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. leader of the Opposition should know that. We have submitted several plans for study to the various conferences and if the hon. leader of the Opposition had read them, he would not have asked that question.

MR. OLIVER: I have read them, but the hon. Prime Minister has said it is for study only, and there is absolutely no plan at all.

HON. MR. FROST: That is not quite right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister knows that.

HON. MR. FROST: I would not say that. I would say we have submitted certain studies, and I propose to give the House on Wednesday the complete results of those studies. The people of this province, and the hon. members of this House, will have the fullest opportunity to study them.

MR. OLIVER: Still no plan?

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): I am interested, and in fact, a little puzzled at the great emphasis the hon. Prime Minister has placed on the fact that there is no commitment to bring in a plan. Are we to assume that if there is no commitment to bring in a plan, there are difficulties in working out some sort of arrangement with the Federal Government?

HON. MR. FROST: No.

MR. MacDONALD: Certainly the public has been led to believe we are going to have a plan and now the hon. Prime Minister emphasizes the fact there is no commitment. What is the significance of that?

HON. MR. FROST: At no time have I given any commitment that there would be such a plan. In any of the addresses and statements which I have made—and I intend to table them—the hon. members will find that the proposal which we made last April—and which we have followed out since that time—is predicated on good business common sense. It is the intention to give to the people, and to the hon. members of this House, the most complete information so it will be seen what is required, because there are great implications in this, and great costs involved, which the people will have to pay.

I am sure the people of this province have always indicated their desire that this matter should be handled in a businesslike way, not in a "shot gun" manner, such as the hon. leader of the Opposition proposed, but in a manner which would justify and carry with it the good business judgment and sense of the people of Ontario. That is the only type.

MR. MacDONALD: It sounds like some of the election promises. They were not really promises.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with the business of the House for this week; on Friday the conference at Ottawa commences. Some of the Legislatures are adjourning, for a period of some days. I do not propose to do that here. I do not think it is necessary we should adjourn, but in order to meet the requirements of keeping up with the business of the House, it may be necessary to have a night sitting tomorrow night. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you would not look favourably on a night sitting on Wednesday night. I

would say there will almost certainly be a night sitting tomorrow night, and probably one on Thursday unless in the meantime it is considered inadvisable.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to. House in Committee; Mr. Edwards in the chair.

### ALL-CANADA PIPE LINE

House in Committee on Bill No. 91, "An Act to facilitate the introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada Pipe Line."

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

MR. OLIVER: On section 2: the other day in discussing the matter of the interest rates, there was a variance of opinion—which is not unusual between the hon. Prime Minister and myself—in relation to the interest rate to be charged. I was of the impression that once the interest rate had been established, it would remain constant throughout the length of the loan. The hon. Prime Minister suggested the other day that it would be subject to market fluctuation, and I think we should have that matter cleared up, because I cannot see how it would be workable to have it fluctuate with the market.

HON. MR. FROST: I think perhaps there was a misunderstanding the other day regarding the fact that the interest rate would vary from day to day, or week to week. I think that is possibly about what the hon. leader of the Opposition was asking. I certainly misunderstood his question. The amount of the interest on \$35 million would be determined at the time the loan would be made, and, in effect, I suppose that interest rate would probably be in effect during the currency of the loan.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

HON. MR. FROST: The federal agreements are predicated upon an early payment of the amount advanced by the federal-provincial Crown company as soon as possible. Indeed there are inducements provided in the Bill to encourage that, and, I should imagine, if the money is borrowed, the initial borrowing would probably cover the requirements and that the interest rate would apply to the whole arrangement.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On the preamble.

MR. MacDONALD: There is one aspect I would like to discuss, although I do not propose to review all the general principles in the Bill, upon which we have some discussion in committee and on second reading, but there is one aspect of this pipe line development which has been receiving more and more attention in the last week or so, and I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would comment on it.

That is in regard to the price at which this fuel is likely to be delivered to industries within the Province of Ontario, industries which are competitive, at least to a degree, with industries in the United States, which are roughly the same distance from the natural gas field of Alberta, and apparently, we are going to find the Ontario industries faced with the payment of as much as 20 cents per 1,000 cubic feet additional.

Saturday's paper, for example, carried one instance which was mentioned in a broadcast by Mr. M. J. Coldwell, the national leader of the CCF Party. I would like to draw the hon. members' attention to another, which was not mentioned by any person within the CCF Party but is in a series of articles on this issue which have been carried in the *Toronto Star* from its staff correspondent in Ottawa. There is a comment, on comparing the situation at Algoma Steel with a couple of steel companies in Chicago, as follows:



What the Canadian gas would be replacing is residual fuel oil, and the 34 or 35 cents at which these 3 American companies would be getting their gas would be an even greater bargain in terms of what competing Canadian industries are paying for their oil.

Algoma Steel, for instance, at Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., is roughly the same distance as Chicago from the Alberta gas fields. For its heavy fuel oil Algoma last year paid a gas-equivalent price of about 55 cents.

It seems to me the question of alternative to handling this pipe line which is going to bring this fuel—this new source of power to industry—in the Province of Ontario, at a price more comparable to that which it is being delivered to competitors in the United States, provides a very serious factor for consideration.

I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister or any other hon. member of the government has any comment to make on this?

HON. D. PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): The Government of Ontario has no jurisdiction over the price which will be charged by the Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company. It is a federal agreement, and they will make their own contracts. Their rate structure as they set it up is all a question of negotiation.

The hon. member has referred to certain prices which are mentioned in a newspaper article, but unless we know all the terms of those contracts, the quantities of gas involved, the load factor, and the other details of the contracts involved, it is quite impossible to say whether the price is fair or unfair, and we have no jurisdiction over that, in any event. I do not know whether there has been any negotiation with the Algoma Steel.

I read in the newspaper this morning that Mr. Coldwell, in Ottawa, had said the International Nickel Company had been offered a price of 60 cents in Sudbury. Mr. Parker of the Inter-

national Nickel Company was quoted in the newspaper as saying they had not been offered any price as yet. There was no basis, in fact, for the statement by Mr. Coldwell and he pointed out the same thing I have pointed out, that it would depend upon the terms of the contract, the load factor, whether it was an interruptible contract or a "take or pay" contract, because if it is, then of course the purchaser can expect to get it for a much lower price.

But if it is a different kind of a contract whereby the purchaser has the right to turn it off and on at will, and the load factor is a low one, it must be at a very much higher price. That is the way all these contracts are drawn, and unless we have all the information about every term of every contract being considered, it is impossible to come to any conclusions on that subject.

MR. MacDONALD: May I ask the hon. Minister another question? I respectfully suggest that he is using these details to confuse the Federal Government. That is the point of my raising the question.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am attempting to show that a great many statements about this matter are based on complete fallacy. They simply take a figure "out of a hat", and say someone is paying 60 cents here and someone is paying a different amount there and, therefore, someone is discriminating against someone else. Unless all the facts are known—and they do involve a certain amount of detail—we have to consider the details in determining the end result of these things. The hon. member is not interested in detail, any more than he is in fact, and it is difficult to persuade him.

MR. MacDONALD: The point I am attempting to make is that negotiations have been carried on at various points along the line already, and contracts have either been signed or are being negotiated. For instance, I do not know whether it has actually been signed between the Consumers Gas and Toronto for 50 cents—

HON. MR. PORTER: If it has not been signed, there is no contract.

MR. MacDONALD: As a lawyer, the hon. Minister is so right.

HON. MR. PORTER: Well, as one who is interested in facts, I am also right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: We know that it will be at the 50-cent level. Various other places along the line will be at other levels, which might vary, depending on whether it is one kind of a contract or another, but we know the general level of it.

The point I am trying to make is that from the likely price at each of these places, people who have looked into it and studied it carefully, and who have contact with others who are studying it carefully, are pointing out this serious development—namely, that the price is going to be much heavier in Canada for industries which have to compete with American industries. It is another problem for us. You may slough it off now as just a “detail”; we do not know the detail, but—

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, as I have said again and again, that is a matter over which we have no control. I do not know what the implications of all these contracts are, because some of them have been concluded, many of them are in negotiation stage, and I just do not know. The contracts, about which the hon. member for York South is speaking, are for industries in the United States, which are concerned with the exportation of gas at Emerson, in the Province of Manitoba, not even in the Province of Ontario, and we are not concerned with that in this jurisdiction in any conceivable respect. That is something which is entirely federal in its jurisdictional aspect, and the hon. member should know that. I do not know why he brings this question up in a way to suggest that we should intervene, dealing with every contract which is discussed and negotiated in Chicago, and many other places south of the line.

MR. MacDONALD: You have just made an agreement with Ottawa, a partnership which is going to bring it into Ontario on this basis, whether you like it or not, you are doing it.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member voted for it. Let him go ahead and explain that to his people.

MR. MacDONALD: I can explain it perhaps better than the hon. Minister can explain another reversal, a year from now.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 91 reported.

### THE COUNTY COURT JUDGES CRIMINAL COURTS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 41,  
“An Act to amend The County Court  
Judges Criminal Courts Act.”

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 41 reported.

### CROWN WITNESSES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 43,  
“An Act to amend The Crown Wit-  
nesses Act.”

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 43 reported.

### THE MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 45,  
“An Act to repeal The Magistrates  
Jurisdiction Act.”

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 45 reported.

### LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 61,  
“An Act to amend The Limited Part-  
nerships Act.”

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 61 reported.

### RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 63,  
"An Act to amend The Reciprocal En-  
forcement of Maintenance Orders Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 63 reported.

### SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 64,  
"An Act to amend The Summary Con-  
victions Act."

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 64 reported.

### CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 66,  
"An Act to amend The Conveyancing  
and Law of Property Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 66 reported.

### ESTATES TAIL ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 67,  
"An Act to amend The Estates Tail  
Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.  
Bill No. 67 reported.

### FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 68,  
"An Act to amend The Fraudulent Con-  
veyances Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.  
Bill No. 68 reported.

### THE LIMITATIONS ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 69,  
"An Act to amend The Limitations  
Act."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.  
Bill No. 69 reported.

### REAL PROPERTY

House in Committee on Bill No. 70,  
"An Act to amend an Act respecting  
Real Property."

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.  
Bill No. 70 reported.

### SETTLED ESTATES ACT

House in Committee on Bill No. 71,  
"An Act to amend The Settled Estates  
Act."

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.  
Bill No. 71 reported.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the committee  
do now rise, and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to. House resumes,  
Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr.  
Speaker, the Committee of the Whole  
House begs leave to report certain Bills  
without amendments, begs leave to sit  
again, and moves the adoption of the  
report.

Motion agreed to.

The House, according to Order, re-  
solves itself into Committee of Supply.

### ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Provincial  
Secretary): Mr. Chairman, in rising to  
report the Estimates of the Department  
of the Provincial Secretary, I will, if  
the House will bear with me, go into  
each branch of the department, because  
there are so many of them.

They include the Civil Service Com-  
mission, the Civil Service Super-  
annuation Fund, Vital Statistics, The  
Companies Act, The Marriage Act, and  
others. It will be necessary to explain  
each one of them in detail to a certain  
extent, and especially so that the new  
hon. members understand how the  
different branches of the department  
operate.

The administration of The Corpora-  
tion Act, 1953: that was an important



Act. There is a great deal of work in the department in the administration of that and other Acts relating to it, including not only the issuance of Letters Patents, but many other matters, such as the issuing of Supplementary Letters Patents, authorizing companies to operate within Ontario, and regarding provincial licences, highways, filings, and registrations.

I am not going to go into those in detail, but, as time goes on, more and more people are seeking the advantage of incorporating as compared to carrying on business in partnership, or as individuals, as the number of companies increase, with the growth of the population and the development of industry. The number of corporations has increased each year, and the last 3 years, the number of new corporations in Ontario has skyrocketed.

Ontario incorporates more companies than any other jurisdiction in the Dominion of Canada. We have concluded the greatest and the most active year in the number of new companies incorporated in Ontario. Last year, we incorporated over 5,000 new companies, and hon. members will understand it is quite a task securing properly-trained personnel who can carry on our work satisfactorily and keep up to date. If we had the proper quarters, we would have about 25 per cent. to 30 per cent. more space than we have at the present time, because we are a number of weeks behind with our corporations, and we like to be up to date. However, that is impossible in the space we have at the present time, and we will have to employ more people to keep up to date with the work.

Five thousand new companies exceeds the number of companies ever incorporated by any one province in any one year. Last year—that is, 1954—the figure was slightly over 3,600 new companies, which at that time was the greatest number of companies ever incorporated in Ontario. The year prior, we incorporated 3,500, and the year before it was 2,100 and the year before that it was 1,700. As Provincial Secretary, I

am pleased to report an increase again in the number of new companies.

In addition, we are going through a period of prosperity never before known and we are having a steady industrial expansion. These new companies, which are being incorporated, are not just for one type of business. While it is true there are a great many development and industrial construction companies, yet companies of every conceivable type are being formed. This is, I believe, a healthy sign of a general development of our economy.

Industry in Ontario is, without doubt, expanding as it never has before. This great increase in the number of new companies has greatly increased the revenue of the department during the last fiscal year. The revenue of the department from incorporation and other fees relating to corporations was \$1,240,000, and in the present year it is estimated that our fees from the same sources will be \$1½ million, or an increase of more than \$250,000, which is a considerable amount.

In order to meet the needs of this expanding industrial and commercial economy, a new Corporation Act was designed which came into effect on April 30, 1954. This new Act was the product of study by a select committee of the Legislature which made an extensive research in company law. The new Company Act has been very well received. We have had no complaints about it whatsoever, and the committee did very excellent work in that regard.

The next Act which comes under this department is an interesting one but it will not interest a number of hon. members in the House so much. It is The Marriage Act.

Under the British North America Act the capacity to marry is a matter within the legislative jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. However, under the said Act the solemnization of marriage or, in other words, the formalities of the marriage ceremony are within the ambit of the Provincial Legislatures. The "formalities" include such matters as who may solemnize marriages, the

authority under which persons may be married, such as licences and banns, and who may issue such authority to marry.

In Ontario the present Marriage Act was enacted in 1950. The former Marriage Act was rather ambiguous. The new Act clarifies it, and makes new provisions to meet new situations. The Marriage Act of 1950 has worked out extremely well and has been very well received.

In Ontario persons may be married under the authority of a marriage licence or under the authority of publication of banns. Marriage licences are issued in the name of the Lieutenant-Governor, or his nominee, and are valid for 3 months from the date of issuance, that is to say, the parties must marry within the 3 months. The clerk of every city, town and village is *ex officio* an issuer of marriage licences.

The Marriage Act further provides that the clerks of townships may be appointed issuers of marriage licences by Order-in-Council, if public convenience so requires. A number of township clerks have been so appointed. Any person resident in the Provisional County of Haliburton—all hon. members know where Haliburton is—or in a township adjacent thereto, or in a provisional judicial district may be appointed an issuer of marriage licences by Order-in-Council, if public convenience so requires. Magistrates in territories without municipal organization are *ex officio* issuers of marriage licences. We have in Ontario, at the present time, more than 500 issuers of marriage licences.

The fee for a marriage licence is \$5, of which \$1 is retained by the clerk of the municipality, \$4 being retained by the province.

A marriage may not be solemnized until 3 days after the licence is issued.

In some cases we give a special permit. That is, in the case of people who, perhaps, may be visiting here, or returning home, and who may wish to take a bride back with them to where they came from. In that case, special

permission is given for them to be married within 3 days.

During the war we had to be very careful, as people were coming here from the United States and seeking to purchase marriage licences and be married here, because, in certain states of the union there were special examinations and tests which they had to go through. It would have been very convenient for them to come here. I had that experience when I was first Provincial Secretary and we were not long catching up with and stopping it.

The less than 3 days' permission was used 184 times last year in the Province of Ontario, so you can see it is not used to any great extent.

Marriages also may be solemnized in Ontario, as above indicated, under the authority of publication of banns. The banns must be proclaimed once in a church in Canada, where the parties are in the habit of attending worship. If the parties attend different churches in Canada the banns shall be published in each church of the parties.

Many hon. members in this House may have thought the banns have to be published 3 times. I know I did, and I have spoken to several people who said that they thought they had to be published 3 times. That is not so. They have to be published only once, according to the Act. There is a general belief, however, that the banns must be published 3 times.

It should also be noted that the banns may be published only in a church in Canada and may not be published outside of Canada. I was surprised when I came to that, that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) had not asked me a question about the Indian reserve up there. However, I may say that we have included the different buildings which they use as churches.

MR. NIXON: I will have a question to ask when you come to the Estimates.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I hope the hon. member will be pleased to find we are not going to charge them



anything at all. We are the most generous people. I do not know how the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) today is able to report the surplus we have, and yet do all these nice things for the little people.

Five days must elapse from the time the banns are published to the time the marriage is solemnized.

Marriages may be solemnized under The Marriage Act only by persons registered thereunder so to do, or by county or district court judges and magistrates. Persons may be registered under The Marriage Act to solemnize marriages only if they are ministers, or clergymen of a religious body having a long history, and who reside in or have a pastoral charge in Ontario. A church is required to keep marriage registers and accordingly, in order that these records be preserved, it is necessary that the religious body prove its permanency through long history. At present there are over 10,000 ministers and clergymen registered under The Marriage Act as authorized to solemnize marriages.

The Marriage Act, 1950, provided for civil marriages in Ontario. Prior to this time, there had been no provision for civil marriages. Under the Act, county and district court judges and magistrates are authorized to solemnize marriages. The Act provides that the judge or magistrate shall collect a \$10 fee for the solemnization of a marriage, and this fee is forwarded to the department at the end of each month. Approximately 3.21 per cent. of the marriages in Ontario are civil marriages.

Other provinces which have provision for civil marriages are British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The percentages of civil marriages in such provinces are:

|                        | <i>per cent.</i> |
|------------------------|------------------|
| British Columbia ..... | 11.              |
| Alberta .....          | 5.               |
| Saskatchewan .....     | .749             |
| Manitoba .....         | .274             |

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will see that the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are not making too much money out of it, as a \$10 bill has to be

returned to the Provincial Secretary when the magistrate solemnizes a marriage. Our province has not gone too high. British Columbia had more civil marriages, 11 per cent. In British Columbia, there is also a fee of \$10 every time, so it is doing very well.

MR. NIXON: They are not so greedy. I do not think they require \$10. Would the hon. Minister say, in round figures, how many marriages there have been under the civil-marriage provision in Ontario? He has said 3.1 per cent. What would that represent?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I will come to that.

If neither party to a marriage has his place of abode in Ontario or, in other words, resides in Ontario, it is necessary for the parties to obtain a special permit from the department before a marriage licence can be issued. There is a \$5 fee for such permit. In order to obtain such a permit there must be reason shown for desiring to be married in Ontario. One reason might be that the parents or relatives of one of the parties resides here. In the last fiscal year 316 such special permits were issued.

If one or both of the applicants for a marriage licence were divorced in a jurisdiction outside of Canada, it is necessary for the parties to submit evidence to the department that the foreign divorce would be recognized as valid by the Ontario courts before a marriage licence may be issued.

A divorce obtained in a foreign jurisdiction is recognized in Ontario, if it was obtained in the jurisdiction where the husband had his domicile at the time the proceedings were instituted. "Domicile," according to our law, means "the jurisdiction where the husband has his permanent home," as contrasted to a jurisdiction where he merely has established residence but has no intention of residing permanently. In the last fiscal year, 472 such permits were issued.

In the last fiscal year, 44,537 marriages were solemnized in Ontario. Of this number, 30,618 were solemnized under the authority of marriage licences,



12,248 under the authority of publication of banns and 1,671 by civil ceremonies.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the Civil Service Commissioner's Branch. There has been a commissioner in that branch, during the past few years, Mr. Foster.

I might say, as the Minister responsible for this branch, that I have had some experience with civil servants and the civil service. Some people might say that civil servants are sometimes becoming uneasy, and think they could do better outside. I was one of those. I was in the civil service in Ottawa, and I went out and went into business for myself. I did not complain. I got along alright. I generally had 3 meals a day and although some of them were not the best, they were still very good meals.

My riding in Ottawa is composed to the extent of about 65 per cent. of the voters of people who work for the Federal Government, in one way or another. It is a real civil service riding. If I had not been in close touch with them for a great number of years, and many had not passed through my hands in the school which I conducted, and if they had not some confidence in what I would do for them—since I had advised them before—I would not be here today, because the civil servants of Ottawa are the people who sent me here.

Some people might think civil servants are different from other people. They blame the civil servants if they complain, if they are looking for increases in salaries, or if their hours are not just what they think they should be. However, can anyone tell me of any place you could go in the country where you will not meet people complaining in the same way, in any industry?

I want to assure hon. members that the complaints in the civil service are not overlooked by this government. They are given very earnest consideration. Of course, if some hon. members go up and down the corridors asking people for their complaints, certainly they will get them. I know the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) would not do that. He would try to discourage

them, and tell them they were well off, and they should not be dissatisfied.

By and large, civil servants are intelligent people, and they take into consideration their security, their superannuation, and so on. The superannuation benefits are increasing as time goes on. Every \$100 or \$200 increase in salary means an increase in superannuation.

Quite a goodly number of the civil servants have been here for a great number of years, and appreciate what happened in the civil service as compared with industry outside, during the depression years. The depression was not felt so severely as it was in some places outside, when they lost everything. I think the civil servants have taken everything like that into consideration. At the same time they feel they are getting proper treatment. I am not saying they are getting proper treatment simply because this government is in power. Even in the case of the government in Saskatchewan under the CCF, or the Social Credit government in Alberta or in British Columbia, or the Liberal government at Ottawa, or in Manitoba, or anywhere else, consideration has to be given to the question of fairness to the civil service. At the same time, they cannot overlook the question of fairness to the taxpayers who are providing the money to pay them. Both angles must be considered when you are speaking about salaries and hours of work for civil servants.

Mr. Chairman, I take credit for something in the civil service, as when I came in, as the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) knows, The Department of Reform Institutions was connected with the Provincial Secretary's office, and I instituted the 48-hour week in different institutions. I will admit now that it cost a little more money than I figured it would. The parties who had advised me along those lines had forgotten that such items as sickness and holidays must be taken into account, and that it is not just a question of one-third more men, or something like that. The cost ran up a great deal higher than anticipated, and, therefore, I say there are

many things besides changing hours which had to be given very careful consideration.

During the past few years, things have not been as difficult with the civil service, for the reason that living costs were not going up by leaps and bounds, as they had been during the war years and immediately afterwards. They have levelled off to a certain extent, and that has made the position a little easier for the civil servants.

When you consider the civil servants, as compared with the people in outside industry, you realize that on many occasions they have to have a special line in the outside industry, and, of course, it would be easier for them to secure the personnel for that industry, because the work would not be as diversified as the civil service.

At the turn of the century, I think the entire civil service was comprised of 700; now, during the intervening years, it has grown to 20,000, which, in itself, represents a great change. I think all hon. members will realize we have been dealing very fairly with the civil servants, and considering that a few years ago only 7,000 civil servants were receiving between \$10 million and \$11 million, whereas today, with between 19,000 and 20,000 civil servants, we are paying over \$60 million, it is a great difference between nowadays and the days gone by.

So it can be readily seen that the governments, as they come and go, have been increasing the number of civil servants, and looking after their welfare. I would say the government is fully alive to the situation, and will have to do something about it, as the hon. Prime Minister said in his address on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for a reply to the Speech from the Throne, we have great difficulty in securing specially-trained civil servants. But we are not the only ones. Industry is also having great trouble in obtaining trained personnel. We have under consideration at the present time a scheme for offering a course in special training to a number of the civil servants who

are anxious and willing to improve their status, and increase their remuneration.

In the report last year, the Civil Service Commission presented a review of the many new and expanding governmental activities, which had necessitated the engagement of several thousand additional civil servants. This has created a problem to which reference was made the other day by the hon. Prime Minister. That is being considered at the present time, and Mr. Foster, the civil service commissioner, is doing something about it.

The expanding work of the Civil Service Commission has required an increase in staff, and has called for greatly-increased activity on the part of the Superannuation Board. During the past year, over 2,000 new contributors were added, bringing the total at the present time up to 15,381.

The Superannuation Board pays out monthly to over 2,000 superannuates, either by way of pensions or benefits. The benefits under The Superannuation Act are as good as any provided by any other governmental jurisdiction, and better than most. This factor has to be considered when salary rates are being set, and it is a factor which has assisted in recruiting and retaining staff. It is our experience that when people have been in the service for two or three years, they realize the importance of the superannuation benefits provided for them, and they do not resign, except for very good reasons. The greater volume of staff turn-over occurs in the first year or two of employment which is, more or less, a trial period, during which, on occasion, new appointees decide whether they prefer to seek employment elsewhere, probably in the hope of securing better positions, or something of that nature.

A few weeks ago, the civil servants turned out for the annual dinner of the Quarter Century Club, and I think some 900 attended. I have no idea at all, but there must have been quite a number more who have been with the government for more than a quarter of a century, but who found it impossible to be present at the dinner.

It is a pleasure to speak to these people who have been with the government for from 25 to 40 years, to receive their ideas and opinions, and hear them say how pleased they are that they continued in the service, and did not leave in the early days when there might have been some feeling of dissatisfaction.

Also, permanency in the civil service is something to be considered. I know the hon. members opposite this afternoon would be very glad if there was some permanency to their positions, and they felt they could be returned here election after election. Therefore, permanency in the service has to be considered.

MR. MacDONALD: George Drew apparently was not so sure of his tenure.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for York South is now speaking about something he knows nothing about. If he had ever met hon. George Drew, and knew him as we do, he would agree that the hon. Mr. Drew is one of the grandest men the Lord ever allowed to live.

MR. MacDONALD: I was speaking about the security of the tenure of office, not about Mr. Drew personally.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. members opposite are simply blah, blah, blah-ing, and it does not amount to anything.

This government introduced the Government-Employee Council into the civil service in 1944, at about the same time the Federal Government instituted it in Ottawa. This provides a vehicle by which proposals from the staff are received and channelled through to the government. Since its inception, many recommendations have been received from the council, on a variety of different subjects.

In that respect, this government has implemented its promises. The hon. members opposite simply make the promises, but have not been in a position for a long time to have an opportunity of implementing them, even if they would. That affords us a great deal of

satisfaction, to be able to go out and say things, and then, being returned to power, are able to say, "We will implement what we have said."

I have been mentioning these things because I think it is desirable that the hon. members of this House, the civil service itself and the public generally, should know that this government is alive to its responsibilities in these matters. At the beginning of this century, as I say, there was but a small number, perhaps somewhere in the neighbourhood of 700. This has grown into a service of thousands, and it will continue to grow, even when I am gone.

I am proud to say that I have been spared to present the Estimates for this department again this year, and I am not speaking about the depression period, but about the desirability of looking forward and endeavouring to see what people will be doing 5 years, 10 years, 20 years hence, even if I am not here.

HON. MR. NICKLE: The hon. Provincial Secretary will be around, alright.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Well, let the dead past bury the dead; let us look forward to the future, look for the brightness; let us not look at the depression period, with its consequent unemployment, because next year I feel sure we will not have a man unemployed, and I will undertake to do my best to see that that condition is brought about. One hon. member said, "let us have full dinner pails, and there will be not much to give us too much concern."

I will not keep the House much longer, but there is one thing I feel I should mention, and that is the report of the Registrar-General. Since we have moved to Lombard St., as the hon. members know, we have been able to do a much better job. We have installed a great deal of new equipment. Prior to moving, when we were located in the Whitney block, we had to keep a great many files in the hallways, and people were sitting there at tables trying to



work. Now we have much more ample facilities downtown.

Some people may not agree with that. I suppose some of the hon. members have received complaints about it, as I have. Some have said because the lower floor is partly underground, that it is damp. We were taken a little by surprise at that, but we begin to find out these things when we move people from where they have been accustomed to work, and to meet their friends, for only 5 or 6 blocks, and install them in a new location, where they may not see their friends except on widely-separated occasions, there is no wonder some of them do not like it. Some say it is damp; others might not say "damp", but say something else which sounds almost the same.

The report of the Registrar-General shows that the demands on the branch have been increasing since 1945. The total number of registrations filed have increased tremendously, and is due perhaps to a large extent to the number of births registered, as the deaths have remained fairly constant, and the marriages have shown some slight decline.

During the past year the general public, either through the mails, or by applying in person, have requested nearly 215,000 certificates, an increase of 7.5 per cent. over the preceding year. There were 262,216 certificates, certified copies of registrations, and "not-in" letters issued. There has been an increase in the letters issued of 4.5 per cent. over the previous year.

Our present method of handling applications for birth certificates was not popular at first with the people of Toronto. Our method of handling applications for certificates is this: if an application is received by mail this morning, from Kenora, it is placed on the desk, then if someone writes in or brings an application from Toronto, that is placed on top of the one from Kenora. The next one may be from Fort William, and that is placed on top of the other two, so when the pile is turned over, they are handled in the

order in which they are received in the office.

Prior to the inauguration of this system, it kept all our people busy making out certificates for people located close to Toronto, while others in Kenora, or Fort Frances, Fort William or Ottawa, would have to wait. The establishment of the new method was not very popular at first; however, we are getting along very well with it. Sometimes, if you are not pleased with something, if you simply smile, it will bring a little pleasure into our lives.

When I was the Provincial Secretary before, the Vital Statistics were under the Provincial Secretary's Department, so that since 1943, I have practically constantly been in touch with Vital Statistics, and I like to take a little of the credit for some of the improvements, because I think they have been wonderful.

I think perhaps there might be just a little influence on people, when they come in for a birth certificate, and notice the name "G. H. Dunbar", because, after 13 years in office, they come to know that name, and they begin to say to themselves, "I want my birth certificate before this man passes on," and they send for the certificate. I think the hon. members would be surprised at the number who write in and say, "I want to receive my certificate while you are still here." So, it will be readily recognized, I am signing "G. H. D." a great deal of the time.

I had thought I was taking out of my pocket one of the early new birth certificates, but I notice it was only a card which has on it, "Keep Smiling", but I have here certificate No. 2, issued in 1946. An hon. gentleman who was mentioned this afternoon, and for whom I had some praise, holds No. 1. He is hon. George Drew. I was No. 2, in 1946.

We have issued over 6 million birth certificates since 1946. People who are nearing the time for becoming eligible for old age pensions are writing in from this and other provinces, requesting their birth certificates.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister where the present hon. Prime Minister comes into line? He mentioned hon. Mr. Drew and himself.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The present hon. Prime Minister comes right after those.

MR. OLIVER: As No. 3?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes. If he had been the hon. Prime Minister at the time, he would have received No. 1.

MR. OLIVER: That explains it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NIXON: First come, first served.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Our Party is a great Party. I sat in Opposition, and I have seen the government members twitching their noses when the then hon. Prime Minister spoke, and it did not mean a great deal. Today, when the present hon. Prime Minister speaks and you hear the thumping on the desks, you know it means something constructive. There is none of the "back-biting" at all.

In order to keep pace with the growth of the province, it has been necessary, over the years, to institute many changes in the office of the Registrar-General. A system of inspectors was introduced, that is to say, we have an inspector for about every 1,000 registrations—not people—who go around from time to time, checking the numbers of birth certificates issued by a clerk, the names of the doctors, the hospitals, and so on. We feel that, in the years to come, we are not going to have the great difficulty which was experienced at one time in connection with people looking for information, or saying, "I am not registered, and I cannot get my birth certificate." These certificates are very necessary in connection with pensions, insurance, and similar things.

Some people seem to have the opinion that if they bring in an affidavit from a clergyman, they can be given a birth

certificate, but we have to have absolute proof, because that is required by insurance companies, and in connection with the superannuation fund, crossing the border into the United States, and so on, and the department has to be very careful in the method of issuing the certificates, in order to assure that they are correct.

We have received excellent co-operation in that department through our inspectors getting in touch with the registrars, which helps in that way to keep right up to date.

In order to operate efficiently, the office of the Registrar-General has incorporated numerous modern appliances, to serve the public better. Completely new alphabetical indexes for births and deaths from 1869 to date have been instituted by the use of International Business Machines and other equipment. This involved the processing of more than 8 million cards, and in addition, work has already been started in preparing marriage indexes which will involve the processing of another 5 million cards. All current registrations will be transferred to microfilm for preservation of the record, and in that connection I might inform hon. members that a copy of such microfilm is sent to the Federal Government so, in case of a fire in the Ontario department, it would be possible to obtain a duplicate from the Federal Government, and, of course, vice versa.

In order to preserve the older records, the bookbinding section, using the latest equipment, including a new type book-binding machine, is working at full capacity. In order to cope with the massive correspondence contained in the thousands of files, modern Sort-O-Graph equipment has been installed in conjunction with the fire control procedure, which is proving to be extremely efficient.

The greatest improvement in this branch was made possible with the move to the new quarters at 70 Lombard St. Due to the fact that the officials of the branch were allowed to work in conjunction with The Department of Public Works, an extremely efficient lay-out

was obtained, which resulted in smooth operation, and allowed the work to be planned for continuity, which had been impossible heretofore.

While we are pleased with the progress of the office of the Registrar-General, Mr. Chairman, we still believe that some improvements can be made in the future. We know we are never perfect, and we are very desirous of giving to the people of the Province of Ontario, and to hon. members of the House who come to us for information regarding deaths, marriages or births, accurate information in the shortest possible time.

On vote 1,601:

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): While we are on 1,601, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister is now in his seat, and I think it is time we came to some decision in regard to the cost-of-living bonus paid to employees in the various departments. I believe it is a correct statement that long ago industry has done away with cost-of-living bonus and in most cases, I presume they have incorporated it into the salary then existing.

It seems to me that to keep on from year to year in each department, adding on the cost-of-living bonus, is simply making more bookkeeping for government departments, and must be an added expense in the administration of government in this province. It does not appear the government has any intention of one day knocking this off, and eventually incorporating it into salaries. As I see it, there is no question about that. However, if that is the ultimate goal of this cost-of-living bonus, let us be frank about it, and do it now.

HON. MR. FROST: What does the hon. leader of the Opposition mean that we should do now? Cut it off? Is that what he is advocating?

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I have already said we should incorporate it into the salaries. That is not "cutting it off," unless my conception of the English language is away out indeed.

Perhaps it is, but surely not that far.

My contention is—and I think it has merits—that instead of continuing year after year to add the cost-of-living bonus, it should be incorporated into the salaries of the civil servants of this province.

I do not know what conceivable reason there could be for treating it otherwise than as salary. The only reason that could possibly be advanced would be that the government had some intention of cutting it off in the near future, or as days go on. I doubt that the government intends to do that, and if they do not, then let them incorporate it into the salaries of the civil servants of the province, and be done with it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The cost-of-living bonus was \$420, and it is now \$120, the \$300 having been added to salaries some time ago. Mr. Chairman, I believe hon. members would be surprised at the number of people who have been paying for homes and who perhaps have other commitments and who thought it would help bring up their superannuation, by so much more of it being made permanent, that they thought perhaps they would prefer a portion of it in their salaries. I know that view was held by some in the department of which I was head at that time, namely, The Department of Municipal Affairs, and it was expressed to me in those terms.

It must be understood that \$300 of the former cost-of-living bonus was written into permanent salaries, leaving \$120. It does not make very much extra work to handle it in that way, as far as I know, and it is costing the government the same amount of money. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will agree that it is never the intention of the government to reduce salaries.

HON. MR. FROST: Certainly not, Mr. Chairman, we always increase them.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is simply a matter of carrying it on. Possibly the hon. leader of the Opposition might have thought this year, when we increased the salaries of civil servants, we might instead have said: "We will put in the



\$120 as an addition to the permanent salaries, and pay no cost-of-living bonus." Instead of doing that, we increased the salaries of civil servants in different departments, such as the Provincial Police Department, The Department of Reform Institutions, and in the hospitals connected with The Department of Health. Then, in the case of those who had not been promoted or given any increase throughout the service, at that time we gave them \$100, later in the fall.

As I say, we could easily have said instead, "We are going to take that cost-of-living bonus into the permanent salaries." But we did not do that. We gave them an increase in their permanent salaries, and kept the cost-of-living bonus in existence.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's argument for retaining the cost-of-living bonus is not a strong one, because he said, "We have already incorporated \$300 out of the \$420, and the reason we did not incorporate the other \$120 is because to do so would interfere with superannuation." Now the government has already taken \$300 out of \$420, surely the \$120 that is left does not constitute a real reason why that should not also be included.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Chairman, I did not mention "superannuation." Perhaps I did not make myself clear, but I said in the take-home money that goes into the employee's pocket, it made it a little smaller when they had commitments to look after, and having the cost-of-living bonus added made it a little larger in the pocketbooks.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could add to what the hon. Minister has said. The history of this matter is that back in the 1940's—I suppose it would be perhaps around 1942 or 1943—because of the upsurge in the cost of living, a cost-of-living bonus was introduced. In 1947, we were, I was going to say "naive enough," to think that we had reached the point where the cost of living had levelled off, and what happened at that time was

the cost-of-living bonus which had then been in existence for a number of years was incorporated into salaries.

At that time also, we introduced the very enlightened classification and salary system which we have continued to the present time, and which has been expanded ever since to provide for permanency of employment. We have done away with political "hirings" and "firings" which were rampant under other governments, when they had what they termed "12th of July parades" from the Parliament Buildings, and that sort of thing. We protected employment, and we provided for orderly increases of salaries, which is the practice followed in all parts of the service.

However, after incorporation of that cost-of-living bonus into salaries in 1947, we ran into the greatest inflationary spiral I suppose in the history of this country. That, of course, was a matter for the Ottawa government; we did not have control of it, otherwise there might not have been the inflationary trends which we have experienced since that time. These inflationary trends were very, very pronounced, as the hon. leader of the Opposition well knows. We thought, in 1950, that things were straightening themselves away, then came the Korean war, and away they went again.

Now, between 1947 and 1954, because of the difference in cost of living and the purchasing value of the dollar, we had added on not less than \$420 as cost-of-living bonus. In 1954—I think in the latter part of the year—we incorporated \$300 of that into salaries, and we left \$120.

MR. OLIVER: Why?

HON. MR. FROST: For the reason that the cost of living has not settled down to a permanent place. There is still considerable fluctuation.

MR. MacDONALD: Does the hon. Prime Minister mean it may be dropped sometime, then?

HON. MR. FROST: Well, it does drop.

MR. MacDONALD: No, I am referring to the \$120 being dropped.

HON. MR. FROST: If I were sure that the cost of living was dropping, it must be understood we would incorporate the remaining cost-of-living bonus into salaries. The difficulty is that the cost of living varies from time to time. If the figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics are taken, it will be seen that, perhaps for a month or two, the cost of living index will drop, then there will be an upward trend, and it may be that upward trend indicates a very considerable inflationary move. We are by no means sure, and I do not think employers are sure.

The hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Thomas), through his connection with General Motors, will know if this is true, but I believe the employees of that company have a cost-of-living factor added to their salaries. We are not sure at all, and therefore we have left that \$120 there, hoping that, of course, the cost of living will straighten away, and become levelled out.

There has been a considerable drop—perhaps I should not say “considerable drop”—but I think there has been a drop of a point or two in the cost-of-living index since we incorporated the \$300 into salary, and it will be our intention, as soon as we are sure that the cost of living fluctuations have ceased to incorporate the remainder of the bonus into salaries.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister what happens if the cost of living goes up? What does he then want to do with this \$120?

HON. MR. FROST: I forget what the index or the formula was, but in those inflationary days, if the cost-of-living index went up a certain number of points, then we added an extra amount onto the cost-of-living bonus. At the present time, it is in a state of flux; it is going up and down. Generally speaking, the trend over the last 18

months has been slightly downward, at least I should imagine so. If we were sure that trend would continue we would incorporate the bonus into salaries.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister is keeping this \$120 cost-of-living bonus as a cushion.

HON. MR. FROST: It is not a cushion at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, but it is, Mr. Chairman. Let me point out to the hon. Prime Minister, when the cost-of-living bonus rises, it can go up 10 or 12 points, and he will still be able to say that it is covered by the cost-of-living bonus presently being paid by the government.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. There is nothing wrong with a bonus.

MR. OLIVER: In other words, if it is incorporated into salaries, and then the cost of living went up substantially, the government would have to create a new cost-of-living bonus. But what it is intended to do, as suggested by the argument this afternoon, is that the government is going to protect itself against paying a cost-of-living bonus, because it is already paying one of \$120.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, we have.

MR. OLIVER: Therefore, you save the province money at the expense of the civil service.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh no. Picking these figures, for the moment, “out of the air,” let us say the cost-of-living bonus was based on an index of 117, and I do not know whether that figure is relevant, but apparently it is, as I am informed that it is around 116 now. The present cost-of-living bonus was arrived at when the figure was higher—118 or possibly 119. It is down now to 116, and anyone who has any sense at all can realize that the present bonus has been based on a higher index than exists at the present time, and the index can rise to 118 or 119 where it was

when the present bonus was fixed, and the present bonus, obviously, covers that. If, however, the index went over 119, then of course there would be an added cost-of-living bonus.

The hon. leader of the Opposition will agree there is no purpose in taking it off at the present time. When the cost of living levels off, the bonus remaining could be incorporated into salaries and I presume that will be the end of the cost-of-living bonus.

I do not know that the federal civil service ever had a cost-of-living bonus, I doubt it very much, but it seems to me that what we are doing is altogether fair. We are not doing it at the expense of anybody. If we were sure that the cost of living was going to stay at about \$116, as it is at the present time, we would incorporate it into salaries, and the civil servants would be getting, as we want them to, the advantage of the difference between that index and the index of 119.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong in doing what is reasonable and good business for the service. I think that is the proper way to do it, and I think it is the way the service would want it done.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have a few general remarks on the position of the civil service which I think could be made as appropriately here as at any other time. It seems to me that the hon. leader of the Opposition has made a pretty effective case for getting rid of this double bookkeeping entry.

HON. MR. FROST: Ours is an argument that is effective enough.

MR. MacDONALD: Alright, we are finished with that if the hon. Prime Minister thinks his argument has been effective enough. However, the thing which interests me is not whether this cost-of-living bonus is paid as a cost-of-living bonus or part of salaries—that is neither here nor there—but I am interested, in general terms, in the amount the civil servants are receiving. I do

not think this government can “get away” with presenting the rosy picture the hon. Provincial Secretary gave us this afternoon about the situation.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for York South always takes the gloomy view.

MR. MacDONALD: I do, and I think I have cause.

HON. MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member believe everything he reads in the papers?

MR. MacDONALD: No, Mr. Chairman, not everything. However, while the hon. Provincial Secretary was painting this rosy picture, I happened to have in front of me—and do not say it is out of date, because it is two years old, because I will bring it up to date in a moment—the *Globe and Mail* for April 14, 1954, when the Ontario Civil Servants Association was making its report.

HON. MR. FROST: What date is that? 1954?

MR. MacDONALD: 1954, right.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, of course, we are continually progressing. Things are bettered from month to month with us, as the hon. member knows.

MR. MacDONALD: Has the hon. Prime Minister heard from them in the last month or so?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: This is what they said in 1954:

The paint yesterday was scraped off the picture of a happy, contented group of civil servants drawn for the Legislature by Premier Frost and Provincial Secretary Nickle.

as he was at that time.

Too often, the report continued, civil servants were portrayed as a happy, contented group. The word “happy” was used as it is applied to school children, and was “at best charitable.”



HON. MR. FROST: May I inquire in what newspaper that appears?

MR. MacDONALD: The *Globe and Mail*, an authoritative paper, sir. Did the hon. Prime Minister expect that I was reading it from *Hush* or *Flash*?

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: We would not be surprised. That is the stuff the hon. member would read.

MR. MacDONALD: This goes on:

The word "contented" has the sound and implication of "docile, plodding, unimaginative drudges."

These are comments from the association's report at the time.

CSA President Harry Bowen reported—

and, incidentally, he is still president—

—discontent on every hand and was backed up by other directors.

MR. A. JOLLEY (Niagara Falls): "Joe" Salsberg read that last year.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not care whether "Joe" Salsberg read it last year or not.

MR. LAVERGNE: Keep to the point.

MR. MacDONALD: It was this McCarthy-like approach from my left that distracted me for a moment.

He also said that civil servants were afraid to report grievances to employee councils for fear of re-criminations.

"Why doesn't the government take off the rose-coloured glasses?" demanded Mr. Bowen.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mine are not coloured, I can see the hon. member for York South quite plainly.

MR. MacDONALD: I did not "get" that, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I said that my glasses are not coloured, I can see the hon. member for York South quite plainly.

MR. MacDONALD: That is fine. If the hon. Minister could see the problems of the civil servants as plainly, there would be more done about it, I hope.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I can see the hon. member bubbling up with criticism all the time, but with nothing constructive to offer.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, that was the view of the civil servants two years ago. About a year or so ago they presented briefs about which, weeks after that, they claimed little had been done, and in fact about 6 weeks afterwards, they had not received official acknowledgment of having presented their brief, with a follow-up letter.

In that brief of a year ago there are one or two very relevant quotations which I would like to read:

The association submits that a complete survey and inquiry into all the phases of the service is now desirable and necessary . . .

MR. MACAULAY: What paper is that?

MR. MacDONALD: I am reading from a brief to the Province of Ontario, from the Civil Service Association of Ontario (Incorporated). These are the civil servants who are speaking their minds and giving the opposite side of the picture from the rose-coloured effort we heard earlier from the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Equally serious, in the overall effect, is the mounting inability of the service to retain its members.

MR. MACAULAY: What date is this?

MR. MacDONALD: It is dated December 29, 1954.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would the hon. member consider a turnover of 5 per cent. out of 10,000 civil servants, including superannuations, deaths, everything, as bad? Where, in industry, would you get 5 per cent. turnover?

MR. MacDONALD: You get it mostly in the underpaid industries. That is the point I want to make. It is an interesting point because often the argument is used that people are leaving the civil service, due to the fact that wage levels are lower, and they are going elsewhere for higher wages.

HON. MR. FROST: The turnover of permanent staff in the civil service last year was only 5 per cent., which includes deaths, dismissals, superannuations, and resignations. I think that is a pretty good story.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not in a position to dispute the 5 per cent. turnover. I am at the moment letting the civil servants speak for themselves, so that we will get the other side of the picture. If the hon. members of the House say the civil service organization is "off the beam", let them go ahead and say it.

External competition—

It is really interesting how the government supporters are not interested in hearing anything but the government's side of the question—

MR. CHILD: Give us something up to date.

MR. MacDONALD: It is up to date. In fact, as I go along it will get even more interesting. To continue:

External competition cannot wholly be blamed for this condition. The failure, by senior officials, to recognize that the provision of attractive physical and psychological conditions of work, coupled with adequate wage scales, are necessary for the recruitment and holding of personnel is reflected in an unsettled attitude of government employees and is affecting the quality of intake.

So that the new ones coming in are of a lower calibre.

The lack of properly—

MR. MACAULAY: What date is that?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member heard it the first time.

The lack of properly constituted personnel management is directly responsible for the lowering morale evident within the service.

MR. MACAULAY: Is this all quoted?

MR. MacDONALD: It is all quoted. And to repeat:

The association submits that a complete survey and inquiry into all the phases of the service is now desirable and necessary.

Here is a rather interesting paragraph to show the response to this:

Reorganization requiring drastic changes or cuts in staff, where such may have unfavourable repercussions, could be done progressively through normal retirements and separations, future recruitments and replacements being subject to rigid methods based on the need for the position, requirements for the job and qualifications of the applicant.

In other words, they are willing to weed out inefficiency where it may exist, but they do not want to do it in an inhuman fashion. They think it can be done progressively.

The hon. member wants me to get up-to-date. I have a very interesting document here.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would the hon. member think, if conditions are as he has stated, that last year we would be able to recruit 3,893 civil servants—if they believed all that?

MR. MacDONALD: I wonder how many of those the hon. Minister has counted are people brought into The Department of Highways at 85 cents an hour as "casuals"?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Not one in here.

MR. MacDONALD: Not in there?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No.

MR. CHILD: Would the hon. member stop reading newspaper clippings and articles?

MR. MacDONALD: I must get my facts somewhere. If the facts are wrong, let us hear where they are wrong. This is an editorial from *The Trillium* of January, 1956. I am rather interested in it, in view of the statement which the hon. Prime Minister made a moment ago, which I jotted down, "that this government had done away with political hirings and firings."

MR. NIXON: Did he say "hirings"?

MR. MacDONALD: That is what he said. Here is an editorial in *The Trillium* and I wonder why this appeared in January, 1956. Are they living in an "ivory tower," or has this some relation to the facts today? It is entitled, "Patronage Produces Prejudice."

MR. CHILD: Why does not the hon. member take the trouble to find out?

MR. MacDONALD: I have found out. It reads as follows:

Practiced extensively in government services in the past, patronage has in later years diminished . . .

I do not have a button to push like the hon. Prime Minister so the applause comes spontaneously—

—or, at least to a great extent, been driven underground.

Can anyone say that the civil servants do not know what they are talking about? Here is an editorial from the Civil Service Association of Ontario, each member of which represents a region, and has an intimate association with each of these departments.

MR. LAVERGNE: Would the hon. member read it again so that we can absorb it?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member needs to hear it twice to absorb it.

Practiced extensively in government services in the past, patronage has in later years diminished or, at least to a great extent, been driven underground.

MR. MACAULAY: What did the hon. member say about "underground"?

MR. MacDONALD:

Patronage has in later years diminished or, at least to a great extent, been driven underground.

MR. LAVERGNE: No, before that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member did not say how far it was "underground." It might not bother us.

MR. MacDONALD: All these interjections will make interesting reading for the civil servants.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member should not worry about the reading by the civil servants. Any civil servant who asks the hon. member to present his feelings in this House is not very particular about getting ahead in the world, because who would listen to what the hon. member has said? He is here just to complain, and not to offer any constructive suggestions at all.

MR. MacDONALD: The "Tory" conception of "Opposition" is that anybody who rises and presents an opposing point of view is a "complainier." You do not have any conception of Parliamentary Opposition procedure. I will present the views of the civil servants of Ontario, and if the hon. Minister wants to say I am "just complaining," go ahead. Maybe the civil servants will say more later.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member has overworked the word "democracy." Down in Ottawa, at the



battle there, the hon. member talked about "democracy" all the time.

Look up *Hansard* for what the hon. member said about reform institutions.

MR. MacDONALD: We will come to that.

MR. LAVERGNE: Come to the point.

MR. MacDONALD: I can understand why hon. members opposite are so disturbed. The barometer of disturbance is the noise from the back benches of the government. It is an indication.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed?

MR. MacDONALD: Pardon?

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed?

MR. MacDONALD: To continue with the editorial:

Any government's policy, if it is aimed at an honest, efficient and economical service, must rest on a sound personnel programme free of interference from outside sources. There can be no room for patronage.

Very simply, they are not writing this as an exercise nor an essay, but they are aware of the inefficiency which has been displayed, and they recognized the significance of what they describe as a "vicious circle."

Patronage produces prejudice.

Prejudice produces inefficiency. Inefficiency necessitates higher taxation, or decreased service, or both.

Taxation affects every citizen.

Every citizen is, therefore, vitally interested in stamping out patronage.

And at the end:

The association solicits the co-operation and the assistance of all persons who subscribe to this aim.

The aim is trying to weed out patronage in this setup. The hon. member wanted it up-to-date.

MR. KERR: Does the hon. member understand it?

MR. MacDONALD: I understand it.

MR. KERR: I am glad the hon. member does, because nobody else does.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, all I intended to do today in the first instance was to let the civil servants speak for themselves, and I just want to make a number of suggestions that may be of a constructive nature in the hope the government will accept them.

If we are going to be able to build the kind of civil service we need in this province, to conduct the largest business in this province—and there are 20,000 people today, and it will grow more and more in a modern state—whether this government likes it or not, it will have to pay higher salaries than we are paying at the present time. Let us quit coming here and telling ourselves we are paying salaries which will get the calibre of people required to run the most important business in this province, because at the salaries at the present time, we cannot.

MR. LAVERGNE: Is the hon. member suggesting the civil servants are not qualified persons today?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, will you kindly ask the hon. member to sit down? He has no relevant question at all. Let him go back to Eastview, and fill the pot holes in the main street.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Never mind. The hon. member was forced into the gutter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. MacDONALD: My first suggestion is this, if we are going to get the proper calibre of people and retain them, we have to pay higher salaries. I was very interested this weekend in northern Ontario, on many occasions speaking with various people attached to this government who were on the tour with the Mining Committee, to hear a comment

made by someone who knows—I will not name the person—that they are finding it almost an impossibility to secure mining inspectors.

MR. CHILD: He was not a CCFer, if he knows anything.

MR. MacDONALD: I wish the hon. member would be quiet.

They are having difficulty securing mining inspectors for the simple reason that the wage they are offering is away below what competent people could secure in the industry, and they are having difficulty in securing mining inspectors. That can be duplicated dozens of times. With the wages the government is paying they only have the chance of getting some poor soul who is willing to come in, because he thinks there may be a degree of security—admittedly—because of the superannuation scheme and is willing to work for a lifetime, at a lower wage for the government, and for the people of this province.

As far as I am concerned, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition put it quite rightly, let us stop having our civil servants underpaid people, living a sort of “sweat-shop” existence. If this is the most important business in the province, give them a salary in keeping with that level, and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) will not find it so difficult to get the right kind of staff to run the reform institutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will please confine his remarks to The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

MR. MacDONALD: I am talking about The Department of the Provincial Secretary. This part of it comes under that department.

The second point I want to make is this—and I suggest it very strongly—that we stop treating the civil servants as second-rate citizens, let them join an organization of their choice, and let the government treat that organization

seriously, as if it were a trade union, and negotiate with them, and give them the power to air their grievances seriously, not in the fashion they have over the years, but let them get right down to it, and get something out of it.

I am suggesting to the hon. members of the government who sometimes want me to go to Saskatchewan, that they themselves go to Saskatchewan, and they might find some surprising things there in regard to civil servants. They are permitted to join unions of their choice, and the civil servants, through their organization, can sit down and negotiate with the government in regard to salaries and conditions, just like any other working people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There is no reason why the civil servants of the Province of Ontario should be treated as second-rate citizens; they are entitled to the same kind of rights under The Labour Relations Act as other workers.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will agree that it is not well to have civil servants in politics. He has been asking for that, I believe.

MR. MacDONALD: No.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member does not want the civil service in politics?

MR. MacDONALD: No; why would they have to be in politics?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we feel there should be no patronage and political interference, and I think that is pretty generally the case in the civil service. The hon. member for York South has no idea of the “mess” things were in when we took over, after the former government had finished with it, for political patronage was rampant.

MR. NIXON: Is it not today?

MR. MacDONALD: No, it is not in regard to appointments to The Department of Highways.

MR. NIXON: What happened to the two defeated "Tory" candidates in Brant?

HON. MR. FROST: They were the best men available and that is why they were appointed.

MR. MacDONALD: Remarkable.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, when the former government came into power, they "fired" everybody who was a "Tory" or whose father had been a "Tory", or whose grandmother or great-grandmother had been a "Tory".

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): That is not the case, and the hon. Prime Minister knows it. Why, the then Clerk of the House was a former "Tory" member.

HON. MR. FROST: When they came into power, they adopted the policy of "firing" men who had been appointed by the former government. In my own riding there are many men who were appointed by the administration, which was headed for a while by the hon. member for Brant. I think it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier who was asked about this question, and he said he did not believe in political patronage, but almost invariably he found that a good Liberal was really the best man. I do not know why I echo that, but I merely say what your great leader said at one time.

MR. OLIVER: All other things being equal, you take a "Tory"?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think it is desirable to keep the civil service out of politics. I think the hon. member for York South will agree that it would be a very undesirable thing to have, as a negotiating agency for the civil service, a union which is pledged to one or another political Party.

What worse arrangement could you have than that?

I judge from the hon. member's name being of Scottish origin, that he must sometimes be not carried away by his socialist ideas, he must at times get

down to common sense. Surely the hon. member would not advise, nor suggest to this House, that the civil service should be connected with a union which is pledged to a political Party. What kind of civil service would we have if they were represented by one of those unions? Would they not be drawing the civil service directly into politics? I do not think the hon. member for York South would be in favour of that, for a minute.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the civil servant is a first-rate citizen who has a right to join any organization of his choice, and if, as a group, they discover they are being treated unjustly, they have a right to change. The interesting thing is that the government of this province has treated the Civil Service Association with a "runaround approach," until the association is about ready to join one of the labour organizations. They are considering this, and it all comes about because of the treatment they receive from this government. The hon. Prime Minister rises in his place and says that I am talking about getting them into politics, but he is going to get them into a union because of the way he treats them.

HON. MR. FROST: They have their own union.

MR. MacDONALD: They have not. They are not under The Labour Relations Act, and they cannot bargain like a trade union. You know they cannot. But soon they will have, and you are going to have some trouble, because of the kind of treatment you have meted out. Mr. Chairman, I really had finished when the hon. Prime Minister rose, and this is just by way of comment on what he had to say.

HON. W. M. NICKLE (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation if I may; from January, 1955, until August, 1955, I was the Provincial Secretary in this government, and the Civil Service Commission was one of the



branches of my department. All the time I occupied that portfolio, Mr. Chairman, no member of this House nor any outsider made any representation to me directly or indirectly, in writing or orally, indicating that any friend of his or a member of his family with the "right political background" should be taken on the strength of the Civil Service Association of Ontario. When the hon. member for York South makes the insinuation which is characteristic of so many of his observations—not based on facts—to the effect that—

MR. MacDONALD: What is the hon. Minister worried about?

HON. MR. NICKLE: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member tries to make out that there was an underground approach, I want to tell him here and now he does not know what he is talking about, because it never took place all the time I was the Minister.

I want to say something else if I may; during the time I was the Provincial Secretary in this government, I never at any time, nor do I now, consider the civil servants of this province as "second-rate citizens." They are first-class citizens. I would say to the hon. member for York South that if he had tried to measure up to the greatness, the sincerity of purpose, and the fidelity of purpose displayed by the civil servants, he would be much better off than trying to smear an outstanding organization which is doing a magnificent job for the ratepayers of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something else. It is perfectly true from January, 1955, until the present time, a great number of people have been taken on as civil servants in the employ of the Province of Ontario, and I think the hon. member should hang his head in shame for insinuating that they are of "low calibre." When it comes to "low calibre"—

MR. MacDONALD: Let the hon. Minister take his petty politics away from here.

HON. MR. NICKLE: The hon. member's verbosity sometimes becomes nauseating.

MR. MacDONALD: I cannot spend my time listening to the hon. Minister.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Mr. Chairman, there have been people who have been employed by the government in the last year and who cannot defend themselves. Apparently that is not the thing to do, and on their behalf let me say that those whom the hon. Provincial Secretary has employed, and those whom I employed before him, are not citizens of "low calibre," they are of a high calibre, and the sooner the hon. member for York South realizes it, the better for him.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to sit down just because the "back benchers" are telling me to. I am not going to sit down when some hon. Minister from the bleachers' seats rises and makes statements like that, and expects me to remain seated. I want to say—and every hon. member knows it—I was not accusing any civil servant of being of "low calibre." The hon. Minister knows that.

HON. MR. NICKLE: The hon. member should hang his head in shame; he should be ashamed of himself.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister rises in his place, and says that nobody, either in writing or personally, attempted to have somebody appointed, because he was a friend of the political Party. That statement fits in exactly with the statement by the hon. Prime Minister, when he said he knows nothing about "contributions to political Parties."

HON. MR. NICKLE: That is true, if the hon. member only knew it.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not saying the hon. Prime Minister does know anything about funds to political Parties. I do not deny that he does not know

anything about this, nor that the hon. Minister would know about people being appointed to the civil service.

Votes 1,601 to 1,604 inclusive agreed to.

On vote 1,605:

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I would not want this opportunity to go by without paying tribute to the personnel in the branch of the Registrar-General. During my term as a member of this Legislature, I have taken up the cases of many pensioners, who could not afford to seek legal advice, and I want to put it on record that I am very grateful to the department as are, I am quite sure, those aged people who could not afford to get their birth certificate without going to the legal fraternity. They appreciate very much the great assistance and co-operation they have had from this branch.

Votes 1,605 to 1,608 agreed to.

On vote 1,609:

MR. NIXON: On vote 1,609, there is a statutory item for "public service superannuation fund" and "public service retirement fund"; how does a "retirement fund" differ from the "superannuation"?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The retirement fund applies to the temporary civil service.

MR. MacDONALD: How many temporary civil servants are there?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: About 5,000.

MR. NIXON: And they do not contribute to a fund at all?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: On transfer to the permanent staff, they do.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this there is one other interesting point I would like to have clarified. How does the hon. Minister explain the fact that civil servants are

brought on and remain on the temporary staff for 20 or 25 years? That sort of thing mystifies me. I was wondering what the official explanation is.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That was covered in the legislation I introduced this session, that any person could be brought on the permanent staff from the time they started employment with the government. It does not matter if that was 10 years ago, if they pay their contribution—their 6 per cent.—the government will pay 6 per cent., and they will be taken on as permanent employees from the time they started with the government.

MR. MacDONALD: Does the decision rest with them as to whether they can become permanent civil servants?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, they make application. They also have to pass a medical. The doctor has to pass on them.

I cannot see why a man who has been there for 5 or 10 years is not in a permanent position.

MR. MacDONALD: In some cases, they have been treated as temporary or casual employees for 20 or 25 years.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I do not think they should be.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the question asked by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has been answered. Regarding the civil servants under the retirement fund, do they contribute?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, to the retirement fund.

MR. OLIVER: Well, if they contribute, would they not come under the superannuation fund?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Not during the first year. But then they do come under the superannuation fund, and would be paying their share, and the government would be paying its share.

When they reach the age of 70, the amount the government paid in and the amount they have paid in, plus interest, would be returned to them.

MR. OLIVER: Do the payments differ between this plan and the superannuation?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No, it is the same thing.

MR. OLIVER: The same payments by the government and by the employees?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, 6 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, there is something I might have explained. After 1952, there was a change made, and any new employees taken on after 1952 pay, into the superannuation, the same 6 per cent. Then, if they are made permanent, that is credited to the permanent fund. Prior to that, the other method was enforced, and they could not come under it until they were made permanent.

Vote 1,609 agreed to.

#### ESTIMATES, OFFICE OF PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

Vote 1,051 agreed to.

#### ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

On vote 701:

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): As a preliminary to this vote I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that The Department of Insurance has a personnel of 50 members, 30 of them being permanent employees and 20 temporary. The work of The Department of Insurance is mainly in connection with the administration of The Insurance Act, The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, The Credit Unions Act, The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act,

The Investment Contracts Act and The Collection Agencies Act.

Twenty-eight members of the staff are engaged mainly in matters arising out of the administration of The Insurance Act and The Loan and Trust Corporations Act. There are 12 employed exclusively in connection with credit unions, 8 exclusively in the Real Estate and Business Brokers Branch, and 2 exclusively on collection agencies and prepaid hospital and medical services organizations.

The Department of Insurance is headed by Mr. R. B. Whitehead, Q.C., Superintendent of Insurance, and Registrar of Loan and Trust Corporations since June 15, 1944. He has senior men associated with him, such as Mr. H. B. Armstrong, B.A. (Math) U. of T. 1916, Deputy Superintendent of Insurance since May 1, 1928; Mr. C. Richards, C.A., Chief Examiner of Insurance since July 15, 1938; Mr. J. Edwards, F.C.A.S., C.P.A., C.G.A., Casualty Actuary since June 1, 1937; Mr. J. G. Gibbons, B.A. (Commerce & Finance) U. of T. 1925, Examiner of Farm Mutuals since November 1, 1934; Mr. James E. Brown, C.P.A., Examiner, Group 2 since August 1, 1951; Mr. W. M. Jaffray, B.Sc.A., Examiner Group 2, Supervisor of Credit Unions since May 1, 1953 and Mr. H. A. Tanton, Registrar of Real Estate and Business Brokers since June 1, 1946.

The Department of Insurance occupies the entire ground floor except for one room at 145 Queen St. West.

Vote 701 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that the committee do now rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions, moves the adoption of the report and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.



HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, might I ask you to revert to Orders of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I was reading the *Toronto Star* today. Generally it has a pretty good editorial page. There is an editorial under the heading, "Distributing Federal Taxes", which says:

Premier Frost used an unfortunate metaphor when he referred to Ontario as a "milch cow" for the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I did not use that expression. I said that Mr. Hepburn, who used to sit in this place, at times used that expression. I would prefer not to use it. I did use the expression about

"the goose which laid the golden egg." I did not make any reference that Ontario was a "milch cow" but I said that Ontario was the "goose that laid the golden egg."

MR. NIXON: The hon. Prime Minister thought that more complimentary than "milch cow".

HON. MR. FROST: I did not wish to use a metaphor which was stale.

MR. MacDONALD: So the hon. Prime Minister took the other metaphor, "the goose that lays the golden egg." That was not stale?

Hon Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:40 of the clock, p.m.



# Legislature of Ontario

## Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Afternoon Session

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Tuesday, March 6, 1956**

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Sixth report, Standing Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Yaremko .....</b>   | <b>757</b> |
| <b>Ontario Parks Board, Bill to establish, Mr. Daley, first reading .....</b>   | <b>757</b> |
| <b>Mining Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Kelly, first reading .....</b>  | <b>757</b> |
| <b>Department of Economics, Bill to establish, Mr. Porter, first reading .....</b>  | <b>757</b> |
| <b>Financial Administration Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading .....</b>   | <b>758</b> |
| <b>Provincial Land Tax Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Mapledoram, first reading .....</b>  | <b>759</b> |
| <b>Chartered Accountants of Ontario, Bill to reconstitute, Mr. Sutton, first reading ..</b>   | <b>759</b> |
| <b>United Co-operatives of Ontario, Bill respecting, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Mining Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada<br/>Pipe Line, Bill to facilitate, third reading .....</b> | <b>760</b> |
| <b>County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Crown Witnesses Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act, Bill to repeal, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Limited Partnerships Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, Bill to amend, third reading ..</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Summary Convictions Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Estates Tail Act, Bill to repeal, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Fraudulent Conveyances Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Limitations Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Act respecting Real Property, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Settled Estates Act, Bill to amend, third reading .....</b>  | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Resumption of debate on the Budget Address, Mr. Wintermeyer, Mr. MacDonald</b>   | <b>760</b> |
| <b>Recess, 6 o'clock .....</b>  | <b>789</b> |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1956

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. J. Yaremko, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented the committee's sixth report, and moves its adoption.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:

Bill No. 8, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Your committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 21, An Act respecting the Township of Stamford.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) J. YAREMKO,

*Chairman.*

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

### ONTARIO PARKS BOARD

Hon. C. Daley moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to establish the Ontario Parks Integration Board."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill applies to the establishment of what is termed in the Bill itself as the "Ontario Parks Integration Board." The purpose is to have a board examine into the many parks, provincial and otherwise, which have been established throughout the province from end to end, to make recommendations as to the advisability and method of establishing some sort of a system of management for them.

### THE MINING ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mining Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with the thickness of the walls separating mines, that is, walls which are called "party walls". The main provision by this amendment is to increase the thickness of the walls from 15 feet to not less than 20 feet.

### DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Hon. D. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to establish The Department of Economics."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, under The Financial Administration Act, provision is made for a provincial economist. We have had on the staff, for a number of years, a provincial economist who, with

a staff, has made surveys and investigations into very many aspects of provincial problems affecting many departments of government, particularly with respect to financial problems.

Mr. Speaker, that branch, under the provincial economist, has been to a very large extent responsible for the preparation of material which has been used in the federal-provincial conferences, and the Provincial Government itself has borne a very large share of the brunt of the negotiations, on an official level, which have taken place between this government, the Ottawa government, and any other governments with whom we have had dealings.

Mr. Speaker, the branch has grown in importance in many ways. Hon. members have before them the submission made to the Gordon Commission. That submission was compiled and prepared by the provincial economist and his staff, with the assistance of many other departments of government, which supplied material. In connection with many other activities of government today, which require special investigations by trained economists, that department is fulfilling a very vital function.

At the present time, the provincial economist is on the Treasury Department staff, but in fact, as a matter of practice over the last few years, the activities of the provincial economist have been in many respects independent of the ordinary functions of the Treasury Department. He has received instructions directly from time to time from the hon. Prime Minister. He also received them from the hon. Prime Minister in his former capacity as hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Now that he is no longer Provincial Treasurer, the hon. Prime Minister still has occasion from time to time to consult with the provincial economist directly and, as Provincial Treasurer, I am called upon, from time to time, to do the same thing. In effect, therefore, the branch is not fully integrated into the Treasury Department, and does not actually come under the supervision of the deputy, in the way the other branches of the department do.

It has been considered of such importance that we think it would be advisable to establish a new department known as The Department of Economics. The present provincial economist would become the deputy of that department, and have the status of deputy in dealings with the senior officials at Ottawa, and with other governments when he has occasion so to do.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for the establishment of this department, which will be presided over by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. That is stated in the Bill. The functions of the officers of the department shall be to study, analyze, advise upon and make recommendations on matters pertaining to economic and financial conditions and trends, economic and financial policies, fiscal relations between governments, and any other matters designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. In substance, that is the content of the Bill.

#### THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. D. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Financial Administration Act which was passed in 1954 outlined the functions of the various branches of the Treasury Department, and certain sections of that Act dealt with the functions of the provincial economist. These sections are to be deleted by this amendment, and will now become obsolete, by reason of the creation of The Department of Economics.

Mr. Speaker, there is another minor amendment in The Financial Administration Act. It is provided now that the deputy Provincial Treasurer is *ex officio* secretary of the Treasury Board. That has not been followed in practice, and it is provided now that the Treasury Board shall designate its own secretary, from time to time. As a matter of fact, the duties of the deputy treasurer are such

that he should be relieved of the duties which are usually performed by the secretary to the board.

Mr. Speaker, there is another clarification section, with respect to the powers of the hon. Provincial Treasurer in connection with offering for sale non-interest bearing treasury bonds.

This amendment inserts something which was omitted from the original Act.

### THE PROVINCIAL LAND TAX ACT

Hon. C. E. Mapledoram moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Provincial Land Tax Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on section 1: the maximum rate of tax under the Act is 2 per cent. of the value of the land. The new subsection 1a added to section 3 of the Act provides an exception to this maximum and allows a rate of tax up to 4 per cent. in the case of lands in provincial parks.

On section 2: the proposed section 5 provides for the taxation of pipe lines on lands outside municipalities in accordance with the same principles as apply under The Assessment Act to pipe lines within municipalities.

### THE CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS ACT, 1956

Mr. R. E. Sutton moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to reconstitute the Chartered Accountants of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Speaker's dinner will be held tomorrow evening, and I have received the suggestion that the House meet at 2 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock. Of course, if any hon. member or members object, we will leave it at 3 o'clock, but I understand that the

hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is satisfied, and I think it would be advisable to meet at 2 o'clock and adjourn at 5 o'clock, which would allow the Press and others to clear up their work.

There has also been the suggestion made that on Fridays, which are usually days with very light committee meetings, the House might meet at 1 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock. I will not make that motion now but the hon. members might consider it. It has been advanced by some of the hon. members who leave here by train on Friday afternoons, but do not desire to be absent from the House.

I might advance that motion tomorrow. In the meantime, if there are objections to it they will be considered. I have no firm views, but only desire to meet with the convenience of the hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves that notwithstanding the provisions of rule 2 of the Assembly, this House will meet at 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon with the purpose of adjourning at 5 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Before the Orders of the day I should like to table the public proceedings of the Federal-Provincial Conference, the preliminary meeting of which was held on April 26, 1955, and the subsequent conference which was held on October 3 last. That conference is convening again in plenary session on Friday, the 9th of this month. I will have a copy of these proceedings placed on the desk of each hon. member. The discussions cover a number of subjects, but have particular relationship to fiscal matters.

In the second book, that is the proceedings of October 3, pages 118 and following, there are a number of comparisons and tables, which will be very informative to hon. members of this House. These will be delivered to each hon. member during the session.



## THE UNITED CO-OPERATIVES OF ONTARIO

Mr. F. R. Oliver moves third reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the United Co-operatives of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

## THE MINING ACT

Hon. P. T. Kelly moves third reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): One word on this, in the light of a meeting which was held by the Committee on Mining in northern Ontario. I would judge, if the information we received is accurate—we will have a further opportunity to assess that information at a meeting of the Committee on Mining, and with representations from the unions in that area—this amendment is unnecessary.

What we are doing by this amendment is to plug a mythical hole in the Act, which Act has in fact been violated for some 19 years, because of collusion which the unions claim exists between mining inspectors and management. We will have an opportunity to assess that further and, if the government thinks the hole is being plugged by this change, I suppose there is no harm in passing the Act, but at least there was new information requested, as the result of the meeting.

HON. MR. KELLY: The hon. member is referring to the wrong Bill. This is the Bill dealing with the mining judge.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I am sorry—we have had our say on that Bill.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

## THIRD READINGS

The following Bills were, upon motions, read a third time:

Bill No. 91, An Act to facilitate the introduction into Ontario of Natural Gas from Alberta by means of an All-Canada Pipe Line.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act.

Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act.

Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act.

Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill No. 67, An Act to repeal The Estates Tail Act.

Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Fraudulent Conveyances Act.

Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Limitations Act.

Bill No. 70, An Act to amend An Act respecting Real Property.

Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Settled Estates Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

The House, upon Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

## ON THE BUDGET

MR. J. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I must confess that as I rise to speak on the Budget, which was presented so ably last Thursday afternoon by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I feel like Mr. John McCloy felt when he attended his first directors' meeting some years

ago after being elected head of the National Bank.

He said he felt at that time like a certain cattle thief who, having been apprehended, tried and convicted, was sentenced to be hanged. On the allotted day he appeared at the proper place of execution, and as he mounted the platform, he turned, and said to the sheriff, "Now, Sheriff, I wish you would take it easy. This is the first time I have undertaken this sort of thing, and I would appreciate it if you would take it easy until I get the hang of it."

Gentlemen, this is the first time I have "undertaken this sort of thing," and as the cattle thief said, I would appreciate it if you would take it a little easy, until I "get the hang of it."

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks, I do want to tell you that I feel very much honoured to have the opportunity to speak on the Budget presentation which was made last Thursday. In particular I would like to tell you that we have, among our group in the Opposition, a man who has distinguished himself in many respects and is well-known to this House, who has distinguished himself in Budget debates, and proved a very good financial critic. That man, of course, is the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). He very kindly stepped aside to give me the opportunity to learn, and to gain much valuable experience, by this undertaking.

MR. NIXON: I just got out of a difficult job.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Likewise I would like to pay my respects to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, not by custom, but very frankly. I felt his presentation last Thursday afternoon was very good, and his Budget was very good. I am sure I can speak on behalf of all of the hon. members of this House in congratulating him, and through him the people of Ontario, for the record revenues which have been produced during this past fiscal year.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, very frankly, I thought he took a more realistic approach to certain aspects of our

revenue position than has been taken heretofore, and I can frankly tell him I had prepared certain arguments I had hoped to use as ammunition today, which have been somewhat dampened by his more realistic approach.

A job of this sort is a difficult one, and can be approached from many angles. I think it only fair, therefore that, at the outset, I give you some idea of the things I intend to present this afternoon.

Firstly, I intend to speak with reference to the comparison over a 10-year period between our estimated or budgeted income and revenue expenditures, and the actualities of those revenues and expenditures as they present themselves at the end of our fiscal year.

Secondly, I will say something about our public debt, our gross debt, and our net debt.

Thirdly, I am going to make some reference to what has been referred to generally in this House as our "credit position". Then I intend to make some reference to that famous fund, called "the Highway Reserve Fund."

Finally, and before my concluding remarks, I want to make some reference to our general economic policy. I think, Mr. Chairman, that resumé of the highlights which I wish to touch upon this afternoon will be of some assistance to hon. members of this House in the determination of the specific objections I have in mind.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, and as I approach my first subject to which I made reference—that is, a comparison of our budgeted and actual revenue and expenditures for the past 10 years—I would like to take the opportunity to table several schedules which I have prepared. Very frankly I do not know whether it is the wish of the House that these be included in *Hansard*, or simply tabled. For myself, it makes no difference. I have an additional copy and will have the opportunity to make reference to them. They are nothing more than figures which are included in the schedules.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming to my first point, I would like to analyze for a little while a comparative statement of actual and budgeted net ordinary revenue and expenditures for the years 1947 to 1955. I have taken a 10-year period, in the hope of trying to find trends in that particular period. I am not going to read all the figures to which I have made reference, but let me say simply that in reference to net ordinary revenue in each of those 10 years, our actual revenue has exceeded our budgeted revenue by at least \$22 million. And during that 10-year period, our total increase over the Budget is \$386 million, or an average of \$38.6 million.

I would draw the attention of the hon. members to the fact that this total increase is in excess of revenue for which they budgeted in any one of those 10 years; in other words, during that 10-year period, by means of Supplementary Estimates, and by means of payments of surpluses to various funds, we have disposed of more money in that period of 10 years than we disposed of in any one year.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so naive as to think the hon. members who are responsible for this are not good estimators. They are good businessmen, and I think they knew what they were doing, and were well advised in the actualities of these revenues. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they had in mind a specific thing, the desire to keep revenues low at Budget time in realization of the fact that, at the end of the fiscal period, there would be a substantial sum to be used as they wished.

Please do not misunderstand me; I am not suggesting any wrongdoing or anything of that sort. I am suggesting that the significance of these paper surpluses is that this House does not have an accurate idea—or at least as good an idea as it might have—at the beginning of each fiscal year of the amount of money available for expenditures during that fiscal year.

For example, let us consider last year. If the hon. members of this House had been told that the probability was there would be far more than \$700-odd thou-

sand available by way of surpluses, I am sure the hon. members of this House would have come forward with many suggestions regarding the expenditures. For instance, they might have come forward with a suggestion with respect to payments of old-age pensions, and many other good and valid suggestions could have been made. But they were precluded, because, in effect, they were told at Budget time: "This is all there is; we are budgeting for a surplus of \$700,000; we have pared the Estimates to the bone; there just is not any more to be distributed."

I think this is a serious matter, because I suggest the significance of it is that to those hon. members who are in charge of this, and the members of the Treasury Department, are delegated certain powers we should exercise.

After all, I acknowledge we vote on some of these things by way of Supplementary Estimates, and we approved the payment of \$28 million, as suggested this year, for the Highway Reserve Fund, and the Sinking Fund, but the fact of the matter is, if we had been told frankly at the beginning of the fiscal year there would be substantial surpluses, I am sure we would have acted otherwise than the way we did. I am sure that suggestions would have come from this House, that we do this or do that.

The expenditures of the fiscal year, when \$41 million must be spent between Budget day and March 31—a matter of approximately 6 weeks—means that we are spending that money in a manner which is not wholly in keeping with the original plan. For 10 months, we adopt a very frugal attitude, and then suddenly, near the expiry date of the period, we open the "flood gates."

I am not suggesting that the idea of Supplementary Estimates is not good. It is, and I am in sympathy with it. But the fact is, had the hon. members of this House been told there was to be \$28 million going to the Highway Reserve Fund, it would have been suggested that part of it should go elsewhere. And I think the recipients—the schools, hospitals, and so forth, which benefit from



our Supplementary Estimates—should have had the opportunity of knowing exactly what they were going to receive, and they could have planned their economy more effectively than if required to wait until the end of the fiscal period, and then take what is left.

Mr. Speaker, the expenditures' side of the Budget demonstrates exactly the same position. In the 10-year interval, to which I have referred, we have exceeded our budgeted expenditures, in each of the 10 years excepting the first one, and in the 10-year period our total expenditures amounted to \$303 million, or an average of \$30.3 million.

In other words, in each year in the past 10, we have spent on a average of \$30 million more than we budgeted for. I do not think that is a good thing. I recognize—and will admit frankly—that if I were in charge of Treasury, I would like that type of thing.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that figure includes the Supplementary Estimates, which were voted by the House.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am quite prepared to acknowledge that it includes all, Mr. Speaker; no question about that.

The point I was going to make was simply that were I in charge of Treasury, I would like this type of policy, because it permits one to make a mistake, which I will not say was covered up in any bad fashion, but at least it was a mistake, which enables them at the end of the year to come forward and demonstrate to the public that an excellent job of estimating has been done. That is not a good thing.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hereafter we be more careful about the Estimates we present. I think we can be. I think it is possible for our experts to advise us very, very accurately with respect to revenues and expenditures, and when the government brings down a Budget, I suggest it be the most accurate estimate which is possible to make, because only in that

way will we have the opportunity of judging the estimate of the expenditures.

In reference to this same problem, may I just highlight some of the underestimates on our revenue side? As is known, the particular sources of revenues for this province at the present time, other than the tax-rental arrangement with Ottawa, are the gasoline tax revenues, the Liquor Control Board revenues, and Succession Duties.

Mr. Speaker, I will not bore the hon. members of the House with all the figures available, but I may summarize by saying with respect to the gasoline tax revenues, we have underestimated our actual revenues by a total amount of \$51 million in the 10-year period, or an average of \$5 million each year.

We have underestimated our Liquor Board revenues by a total of \$79 million, or an average of \$7.9 million each year. I would like to draw this extraordinary fact to the attention of the House with respect to the Liquor Control Board revenues. In the years 1952-1953, 1953-1954, and 1954-1955, we budgeted for \$36 million in revenue in each of those years, but at no time, after 1949, did we ever receive less than \$40 million in revenue from that particular source. It was as obvious as it could be to the experts that we were going to get more than \$36 million in those years. Last year, the estimate was increased to \$38 million, and we received \$48 million; in other words, we were out in our estimate by \$10 million.

I will acknowledge that this year the hon. Provincial Treasurer has, in my opinion, been more realistic. I believe he is budgeting for \$49 million, but I would remind the hon. Provincial Treasurer that last year we received \$48 million, and if we are to judge by the significance of his Budget, I can understand the hon. Provincial Treasurer is saying to us, "We can look forward to good revenues this year, in excess of what we received last," and if that be so, I suggest the figure is still unrealistic.

With respect to Succession Duties, Mr. Speaker; may I say the total underestimated revenue in that specific field

over the 10-year period is a total of \$43 million, or an average of \$4.3 million each year. I am quite prepared to admit it is rather difficult to estimate these Succession Duties. For one thing, we do not know who will die in any particular year, and it is quite understandable that in a particular year, certain very wealthy people may die, which would substantially change this source of revenue.

But, on the other hand, I think our experts are sufficiently schooled to be able to demonstrate trends, and to tell us approximately what we are going to receive from that rather indefinite source of revenue. And I would suggest also, in this respect, that we have well underestimated our revenue in each of the last 10 years.

I am frank to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am wholly inexperienced in this particular subject, but I will predict there is a great deal of money in the "old sugar bowl" yet. I am sure there is a great deal tucked away which has not been fully divulged. Again I do not want to create the impression of wrongdoing, but I think the government knows right now that it will receive a great deal more than \$700-odd thousand by the end of this fiscal year.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, may I say that all hon. members must realize we are not budgeting for \$700,000; we are budgeting for a surplus of \$20,700,000, because after all, it is suggested to us that out of our ordinary revenues, we take the sum of \$20 million and set it aside for a Highway Reserve Fund, which is certainly a capital account. It seems to me that is a surplus, just as surely as anything else. I think, at least in part, it is not right to tell the people of Ontario there will not be a surplus according to our Budget, when, in fact, there will be a surplus in the amount of \$20,700,000.

Those are the remarks, Mr. Speaker, I intended to make with respect to the comparative statements to which I have referred. I would ask the indulgence of the House for just a moment to enable me to segregate my notes and be sure I

have covered the various comments I wanted to make on this particular subject.

I note I have one comment upon which perhaps I did not specifically elaborate, and that is the fact that it seems to me one of the things we must criticize, about underestimated revenues, is the fact that our municipalities and other beneficiaries, which benefit from the Supplementary Estimates, have no opportunity to know at the beginning of their fiscal years—which are normally the first of January of each year—what they will receive out of the Supplementary Estimates. I think, in fairness to those institutions, we have an obligation to be more specific, more business-like, and more planned throughout the entire 12-month period.

I would now like to refer to the second subject, to which I made reference at the outset, and that is the general subject of debt. Again, I do not want to bore the hon. members with detailed figures, but let me say this, so the hon. members will have the picture in mind, that it is my understanding that, on March 31, 1955, our gross provincial debt was \$1,066 million, and I believe that particular statement is substantiated by the public accounts for the end of 1955.

I believe, likewise, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer, with our gross debt as of March 31, 1955, estimates that at the present time it will be \$1,100 million, or \$1.1 billion, an increase of \$34 million in the past fiscal year.

Referring now to what we normally call the "net debt"—and again with reference, firstly to the March 31, 1955 figure, our public accounts would suggest that a year ago our net debt was \$660 million. The hon. Treasurer has suggested in his Budget that as at the present time—and I mean March 31 of this current year—the net debt will be \$732 million, an increase of \$72 million.

The third figure to which I would draw the attention of the House, before making my comments, Mr. Speaker, is that our hon. Provincial Treasurer has, I believe, budgeted \$28 million for

interest in this coming fiscal year. So we have this basic situation to keep in mind; we have a gross debt of \$1.1 billion, and a net debt of \$732 million, and our interest charges for the coming year amounting to \$28 million.

Mr. Speaker, with that general background in mind, I would like to refer to a matter with which I am sure all the hon. members of this House will agree, as will the persons whom I feel sure are experts on this subject.

Now may I read briefly from some comments which were made in 1944, and the identity of the person making them will be obvious to hon. members.

One of the great problems confronting the Province of Ontario is the great burden of net debt which we have accumulated over the past 40 years. This debt is now in the neighbourhood of \$500 million. Interest on this debt, which must be paid from the people's taxes, amounts to about \$20 million annually. The fact that we are faced with paying about \$20 million annually out of ordinary revenues for interest alone should cause us to hesitate before we increase this type of debt.

A glance at the schedule will indicate that we must pay special attention to the matter of net debt. As previously stated, the interest on this type of debt is now over \$20 million annually. During the war years we should conserve our credit by stabilizing our net debt or by reducing the same if at all possible.

As soon as the Dominion-Provincial Tax Agreement is terminated at the end of the war, we must make provision for the orderly retirement of the present net debt and provide that all future borrowing will be retired within the lifetime of the works for which they are incurred. All of this, of course, is predicated on balanced Budgets.

I shall outline a general plan for the consideration of the House which might be followed on the termination of the Dominion - Provincial Tax Agreement:

1. That a sinking fund be established which will extinguish the present net debt of the province over a period of not more than 50 years.

2. Future capital expenditures, which will fall into two classes: (a) revenue producing, such as highways; (b) Non-revenue producing, including such items as public buildings and other uneconomic works; these may be considered and dealt with as follows:

Class (a): The expenditures under this heading will be principally for highways. The revenues, therefore, produced by such highways or other work would be allocated as follows:

- (1) To pay the ordinary cost of the operation of highways or other work, including repairs and maintenance;

- (2) To pay such annual subsidies to municipalities and counties as are found necessary and that all such subsidies be chargeable to ordinary and not capital account;

- (3) To pay interest at an agreed rate on the amount of the present highway debt of the province;

- (4) To repay to the province in annual instalments spread over an agreed term of years the amount of the highway debt;

- (5) To be applied to the construction of new works of a capital nature;

- (6) To return to the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the province for general purposes of the government any surplus in excess of amounts required under paragraphs (1) to (5) inclusive.

It should not be argued that the revenue from highways should not be used for such general purposes. I think it is fair to say, however, that they should not be so used until obligations relating to highways have been taken care of.

Where the amount of revenue available for expenditure as outlined in paragraph (5) is insufficient to pay the cost of construction of new works, debentures should be issued



for a currency not to exceed the contemplated life for which the debentures are issued. The debentures should be in serial form and be a charge upon the revenues above referred to.

In order to conform to the rule that the cost of new work must be paid for within the estimated life of the construction, depending upon the extent of such new works, additional taxes might have to be levied.

As to capital expenditures under class (b) which relate to non-revenue producing works such as public buildings or other uneconomic works and which constitute a dead-weight debt, I would point out that as much as possible of the cost of construction of such non-productive work should be paid for out of ordinary revenue (we are applying this rule to ourselves) in the year in which such construction is carried on and the balance of the debt should be liquidated over a period not to exceed 15 years. For this purpose debentures should be issued which mature annually and the instalment should be paid annually out of ordinary revenue from year to year and should not be refunded.

All of the foregoing is, of course, predicated upon governments having the wisdom to tax for services which are given. The rule should be that we have balanced Budgets and a wise use of our credit. A disregard of these principles will impair or destroy our credit, which is one of our greatest assets, and will place our province in a debt-ridden position.

HON. MR. FROST: Who wrote that? That is a very wise statement.

MR. OLIVER: Chester Walters.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, I agree fully with that statement, I think it was a very wise analysis of our debt position. That statement was made in 1944, and it was made, of course, by the then Provincial Treasurer. It demonstrated, at the beginning of

his regime, a very business-like approach to this problem.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you the unfortunate thing is that those particular suggestions have not been implemented in the intervening years. I suggest that the wisdom of the statement is as applicable today as it was 10 or 12 years ago, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, extraordinary that last Friday we had the unusual spectacle of the hon. Provincial Treasurer—and I assume the hon. Prime Minister was in agreement with what he said—say to us that there was no need to liquidate the bonds in the form of serial payments or amortized payments over a stipulated period of years.

I suggest to you that what the hon. Prime Minister was saying 12 years ago was that we have a debt of \$500 million, so let us realize that we are paying \$20 million to service that debt by way of interest; we have to overcome this position, and the way to do it is as follows: firstly, let us liquidate the debt over the next ensuing 50 years, and then with respect to these capital expenditures which are going to add to our debt, follow the following plan:

Firstly, if they are revenue-producing, such as highways, over the life of the highways. In other words, the bonds which are issued for the construction of highways will be liquidated in an orderly fashion by yearly payments over the period estimated for the life of that highway. For non-revenue producing, out of ordinary revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that is in direct contradiction to what we were told last Thursday afternoon. It seems to me that government policy has materially changed in this respect, and I think it is time that we go back to the wisdom of the statement which I have read to you, that we attack this matter in a realistic way, and recognize that we are aiming for the day when our debt will not be what it is today, when we do not have to pay even \$20 million for interest—and it is \$28 million at the present time.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, is that not one of the complaints which was directed against me when I was Treasurer, that I put too much into the sinking fund?

MR. WINTERMEYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some comments I would like to make, in respect to the sinking fund.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. member is coming to that.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is very difficult to know whether you are paying enough or not enough into the sinking fund. All I can say is, the schedule to which I made reference at the outset, and to which I would refer again, would suggest that our "stinking fund" instalment payments—excuse me, the sinking fund—

MR. OLIVER: That is just what it is, the way it is being handled.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker that our sinking fund instalment payments are not made in a planned fashion. For instance, in the last 10 years, we have budgeted basically as follows: in 1946 to 1951, we were budgeting for payments of \$5 million each year into the sinking fund. That was increased to \$7 million, for the next ensuing two years, and thereafter to \$9 million, \$14 million, and now it is \$17 million.

However, Mr. Speaker, our total increased payments, over and above the Budget, were \$107 million in the same 10-year period, an average of \$10 million per year more than budgeted for. My criticism is that it seems to me we should have the matter brought into this House and discussed, to determine what the policy of sinking fund payments actually is, because what is happening at the present time is that the payments may or may not be sufficient to carry out the policy. I do not think we have ever been told specifically what that policy is, and I agree that

I am in no position to say these payments are enough or that they are not enough.

The point I make is that I think the House is entitled to the confidence of this government to the extent that this House have explained to it what the policy of sinking fund payments actually is. I suggest that it seems the policy, at the present time, is considerably at variance with the policy which was laid down by the hon. Prime Minister 12 years ago, and which, as I said, I think was a wise, business-like attitude toward the problem.

I suggest that it is not an impossible objective to have in mind the reduction of the debt. Michigan, at the present time—and with your permission later on I will try to make a comparison—has a debt substantially less than ours and they have made a real, direct and effective onslaught in the direction of debt reduction.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will now proceed to my third point, and that is in regard to the matter of credit. We have had many references to our credit position made by hon. members of this House during this session, and, with deference, I think the statements which were made in that respect are good, and we are all agreed that we must be very protective of our credit position. What I would like to suggest is one way by which we might possibly improve our credit position, and before doing so, may I refer briefly to public accounts.

In this reference all I intend to do, Mr. Speaker, is to say—and perhaps I can abbreviate it—my references are to pages 33 and 42 of the public accounts. I am trying to point out I do not think there will be any dispute about it, but let us simply get the particulars before I make any suggestions. The difference between our gross debt and our net debt is simply this; we owe the gross debt, the \$1,100 million, but the fact of the matter is—and we will honestly acknowledge it—that of that debt there are many instances—for instance, Hydro, we will borrow the money, and then hand it over to Hydro; Hydro in turn will give us a

note or a bond in the exact terms of the original borrowing we effected—the result is that that sum added to gross debt is really not—well, I should not say really the province's obligation, but at least, it is self-liquidating to that extent.

This difference between gross and net is approximately \$400 million, and of that \$400 million, Hydro uses \$300 million, or three-quarters of it. I acknowledge that we receive interest from Hydro. My suggestion is, why not divorce Hydro financing from our provincial financing? I am not making any criticism of Hydro, and I do not want to be misunderstood in this respect, but I simply am trying to offer some constructive suggestions to the government, and I honestly feel that at the present time Hydro has developed and matured to a point where it can stand on its own feet, and I do not think there is any need for us to borrow further money and hand it over to Hydro, and then take back Hydro's note. I think Hydro can go into the money market and get money as well as we, not at the same rate, of course, but after all, Hydro is a mature, effective public utility, one of great stature, and there are very few public utilities of the size and physical strength of that institution.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that other public utilities go to the money markets and borrow, so why not Hydro? I know I am going to be told, "Oh yes, that is alright, but the situation is rather complicated, because in the United States, it is difficult for an institution such as Hydro to borrow money, because of the regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which make it very difficult, or, at least, more difficult for Hydro to borrow in the United States than in the province."

I will acknowledge that, but I do not think that is a valid argument. After all, if the fact is it is going to be a little harder for Hydro to conform with those regulations than it is for the Province of Ontario, and if the effect is a little delay in securing the money, I do not think it is a valid argument.

Secondly, if the objection is that the interest rate charged Hydro will be a

little higher than to the province, I do not think that is a valid argument, either, because, after all, we are paying something to Hydro at the present time, and we are—

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there is much of what the hon. member says with which I agree, but in connection with Hydro borrowing in the United States, and the provisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Hydro's credit has been very much affected by certain Statutes which were passed here in 1935, in relation to the repudiation of certain contracts, and it makes it very difficult for Hydro.

MR. NIXON: Just in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: I am stating that is the fact.

MR. NIXON: Just the hon. Prime Minister's imagination, which is not too good in that respect.

HON. MR. FROST: It is not my imagination, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, may I simply say this in respect to the problem, that when we examine our sinking fund, we notice we are referring to bonds issued in the years to which the hon. Prime Minister has made reference, and I think they are being liquidated in a very orderly fashion. Mind you, I am not suggesting we do anything; do not misunderstand me. What I am suggesting is if we insist on Hydro financing its bonds in the way they were required to be financed in 1934, when they were put on definite serial form, and definite sinking fund arrangements were set up, I think we would be better off to that extent.

However, let me not get away from my principal point, and I make it with all sincerity, and with no thought of creating political capital. I submit we would be better off and would improve our credit by divorcing Hydro. I am not being critical of Hydro in any way,



but I think it would improve our position. The hon. Prime Minister has said we are going to have a difficult time protecting the future payments which are going to be made, and I think this is one way of protecting our credit, without hurting anybody.

Mr. Speaker, the next subject to which I would like to make some reference—and I must necessarily do so with some degree of hesitancy—is the matter of the Highway Reserve Fund. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the real rewards of a job like this is the fact that you have to “get down to brass tacks,” and one actually learns a great deal of the financial affairs of the province one would not, otherwise, have the opportunity to do. In respect to the Highway Reserve Fund; I spent a good portion of last week-end following payments from ordinary revenue into the fund, out of the fund, as capital payments, to capital assets, back to surpluses, and adjustments of surpluses, in fact, to the extent that, at the end of many hours, I must admit that I did not understand the mechanics of the fund.

MR. OLIVER: Neither does the government.

MR. WINTERMEYER: However, I want to refer to one particular aspect of the fund. As I understand it, the situation is that this is a fund into which the hon. Provincial Treasurer last Thursday suggested we pay \$28½ million, out of surplus this year, and out of ordinary revenue for the fiscal year 1956-57 we pay \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, let me analyze the fund in that respect. The Consolidated Revenue statement, as appears in the public accounts, at pages 6 and 7, would suggest that at the beginning of the 1955-56 year, that is, as of April 1, 1955, the fund stood at \$52 million.

The Budget last Thursday demonstrated that in this year, 1955-56, we have taken out of that fund \$37 million by way of capital allotments and it is suggested that we put \$28½ million into the fund at this time. Therefore now, or as of the first of April, the hon. Pro-

vincial Treasurer estimates that there will be a balance in that fund of \$43 million.

Mr. Speaker, projecting ourselves a year ahead, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has suggested that in the fiscal year 1956-57 we allot to that fund the sum of \$20 million and that we take away \$37 million by way of capital payments, so that the fund a year from this coming April will be \$26 million.

I would point out, of course, that if in the Supplementary Estimates a year from now we add to that fund the way it is suggested we do this time, that fund will not be \$26 million but up around the \$50 million mark again.

We reviewed this situation a year ago and we thought the fund would be in the neighbourhood of \$27 million, whereas at the present time we find it is actually \$43 million.

My basic objection is that you are allotting out of ordinary revenue money which will not be spent in the immediate fiscal year. This fund will have at least \$26 million in it in April, 1957, and out of our current revenue for 1955-56 we are taking \$28 million. On the face of it, that \$28 million cannot be spent until after April 1, 1957.

It seems to me wholly unrealistic to set aside large sums of money in that way out of ordinary revenue for purposes so far in the future. After all, if there be any reason for it, the same reason would apply to other departments. The Department of Education and worthwhile public welfare departments would like to have this sort of protection. I do not think the protection, nor the intent of the fund, is that at all. Very frankly, it seems to me the purpose and the conception of this fund was to hide—and I am not using that word in any derogatory fashion—or to siphon off the surplus in each year. This year, having \$28 million and paying it into that fund, the significance is that we are creating in the popular mind the impression that there is no surplus at all.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would refer to that very admirable statement he read a short

time ago, he will see that it refers to paying as much as possible off capital account from current revenue. The hon. member will recollect that. That is really the purpose of the Highway Reserve Fund and I think the hon. member will find that its purpose is altogether admirable.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, I have the highest personal respect for the hon. Prime Minister and what I say now is not in any sense a personal remark, but is purely objective in its entirety.

HON. MR. FROST: I know that.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, may I refer the hon. Prime Minister to a statement he made in 1952 when this fund was set up. So that it can be easily identified, I am reading from *Hansard* for March 11, 1952, page E-5. I am referring specifically to the statement by the hon. Prime Minister, which reads:

HON. MR. FROST: In making the motion, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, I shall reserve anything I have to say for the conclusion of the debate. As far as the motion, that is wide open to hon. members of the House to speak.

I must admit that I have not at the moment anything to say particularly, except that this sum of \$20 million which we are asking the Legislature to vote will be placed in this fund and will be used for works which have been announced since the rising of the House last April: the works involved in the great Toronto bypass, the building of the bypass at Kingston, and the road from the vicinity of Kitchener over towards Toronto; the bypass at Orillia, and other works of that sort. Already contracts have been let, the work is actually proceeding, and most of this sum is going to be required.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that at the time that fund was set up, specific capital works were envisaged. We had

just gone through the war years. I can understand that much capital work accumulated, that there was a desire to set aside money which should have been spent during the war years, but which was not spent, simply because it was good policy not to spend money on capital expenditures during those years. I think that was the purpose for which that fund was set up.

At that time, specific reference was made to specific work.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know that the work specifically referred to has not been completed today. To the best of my knowledge, the Kitchener-Toronto road has not been started, yet money was appropriated 3 years ago for it. I am not being critical that it has not been started—there is a reason. But we set aside money for a specific purpose and now, lo and behold, we find 3 years later that the money has not been used. I suggest that the same thing will happen again and again, that the \$28 million set aside is not going to be used in the next 3, 4 or 5 years, and after that time, for what it will be spent we do not know.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion on this point, I would remind the House that it is acknowledged this particular arrangement is an improvement over the arrangement under The Highways Improvement Act. I will acknowledge that, but what is happening is that we vote money into that fund—as it is suggested we do immediately—but we do not vote money out of it; it comes out as a statutory payment.

I am not suggesting that there is anything irregular about the payments out, but it is not good policy. We, of this House, should have an opportunity to vote money out of that fund, and to know exactly what is being done. I will acknowledge that the hon. Provincial Treasurer this year gave us some assistance, as appears on page A-21.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that we abolished the statutory payments out of the Highways Fund. The money is now voted, and the money is then charged to the Highway Reserve Fund. The statutory pro-

visions which formerly applied under The Highways Improvement Act were abandoned, I think in 1952, at the same time as this arrangement was introduced.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister may have more personal knowledge than I, but to the best of my knowledge, the payments out are not voted.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, they are now.

MR. OLIVER: How does the hon. Prime Minister say they are voted out?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that in the Estimates in this House, let us say \$100 million is voted for capital expenditures for highways, and the specific details of the programme are presented to the House, as they were on Budget day, and as they were last year, then those items, as they are performed, are charged to the Highway Reserve Fund.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who suggested that Statute be done away with in 1951.

HON. MR. FROST: We may follow some of the things the hon. member has recommended. The hon. member is making an excellent speech.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, with due deference, I am inclined to agree with the hon. Prime Minister that in that form they are voted out in a general sense, as they are included in the Budget. Reference is made in Appendix A-21 to the sums taken out, but I suggest that there is no specific vote, in the sense that we specifically vote the money.

HON. MR. FROST: I think that is right.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Mr. Speaker, that is the point I wish to make. My last point with respect to this particular subject is as follows. Let hon. members think in terms of that \$28½

million being taken out of revenue, and put into this fund. We all realize that our motor vehicle taxes were increased this year.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is not the \$28 million the hon. leader of the CCF was talking about?

MR. MacDONALD: I was keeping very quiet and not saying anything.

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am talking about the \$28½ million which the hon. Provincial Treasurer has suggested we vote into this fund for the present fiscal year. I am suggesting to you that this fund, to the extent of \$11.3 million, is made up of the greater amount we will derive from our increased motor vehicle tax revenue. It seems to me to be grossly unfair to say to the public, in effect, "We need \$11.3 million additional money and we are going to tax your motor vehicles to that extent," and then put that money into a capital account which may not be used for years to come.

Certainly, I would think that is justifiable criticism of that particular tax. I think everybody had the right to expect that the money would be used this year, and there is no assurance so far that it will be so used.

I am quite prepared to acknowledge that I am speaking generally about this subject. You cannot earmark \$11.3 million, but the effect is that if we had not increased the tax, we would not have had \$28½ million but \$11.3 million less which came from revenue, and it was expected by the people, generally, that it would be used during this current fiscal year, and not 3 or 4 years in the future.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in explanation of that, I would remind hon. members that at the end of the year there might be \$25 million in the Highway Reserve Fund, but against that you may have contracts, which are in course of performance, on which amounts are probably not payable at that time but may be payable in the ensuing 3 or 4 months.



MR. WINTERMEYER: I acknowledge that, but on the other hand it must be acknowledged—and that is the point I wished to make at the outset—that this fund seems to maintain itself at a consistently high figure—\$52 million and \$43 million—which is a very substantial sum. I know that momentarily it is somewhat depleted, but the time will come when it will be reimbursed and then it will be up again. That will bring it up again to the vicinity of \$40 million to \$50 million, which, I think, is unnecessarily high.

I am not being critical of the highways programme at all. Very frankly, I am going to acknowledge later on that we need to build a great many roads; but I do not think these large amounts are necessary.

I think we have attained a position in our capital development where we can take capital payments out of revenue in regular form, and pay them directly to highways. It may be that, in financially immature years, this present method was desirable but I do not think it is desirable now. It is subject to the first criticism I made, that it is a very convenient means of siphoning off surplus to capital expenditure, in a manner which might be somewhat misleading to the general public.

I believe this House, as such, should realize that but for these payments we might put more into such things as old-age pensions, or the myriad of other things which may come to our attention. The fund can be criticized to the extent that we are denying, inferentially, the opportunity to bring forth these suggestions—because, on paper, there is no demonstration of a surplus. If there was a demonstration of surplus, we would be more inclined to make suggestions for expenditure.

This is my concluding remark with respect to the Highway Reserve Fund. It had nothing to do with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter), but I make the remark, and I hope that it will be treated seriously because, although it is a small point, something might be made of it. As we analyze

the highway expenditures, we note there are terrifically large sums for county and rural road maintenance. You and I know that by and large, most of those roads are gravel roads, and I suggest that the cost of maintaining gravel roads is prohibitive. I would suggest to the government that if it has this type of money in capital account, it should consider the advisability of spending substantial sums of money to hard-surface those roads once and for all. I think that in an extended period of time they would more than recoup the expenditure on them, and it will be shown that it was not only a desirable and helpful, but financially a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the last of my basic subjects, that is, an economic survey, as such.

So there will be some objective to what I intend to say, let me now say something about the point at which I intend to conclude after making my remarks in regard to an economic survey. The conclusion I am going to try to make is this: I am going to suggest to the hon. members of the government that a committee of this House should be set up to analyze our economic position in the broadest possible terms. I think that the time has come now when we must realistically assess our position, and ask ourselves whether our sources of revenue are sufficient to carry out the programme we have for the future.

We have to ask ourselves whether, if our economic progress continues to develop the way we hope it will, even though it be buoyant, whether this buoyancy of revenue will be sufficient to do what we want to do. I am not suggesting it will not be sufficient. I am not suggesting any new taxes. But I do suggest there ought to be an honest and statesman-like analysis of the position of our probable revenues in the future. We have been making good progress on the planning board, drawing up programmes costing a great deal of money. I think it is something that is intelligent, good economy, and good for business that we try to get an estimate and an assay of our future position.

Mr. Speaker, I think that assessment should be made by hon. members of this House. I am not referring to the Department of Economics which has been set up.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can ask anyone else to do it. We are the elected representatives, and it is our job to know something about these things, and to make recommendations to the government.

I am quite prepared to do that, and I suggest we consider recommendations from experts, economists, and the like. I think we have to "get down to brass tacks" and study this problem in a realistic manner. I do not think any committee which may be set up during sessional periods is adequate.

I think such a committee must sit between sessions and study it thoroughly, and I think this committee should be manned by several hon. members of this House, so that as many as possible who want a better understanding of our fiscal position, our obligations, and our overall picture may have an opportunity to learn exactly from whence we have come, where we are going, and how we are going to get there. I think such a committee could do a real service to the government and come up with many practical suggestions.

With this in mind, may I refer briefly to the statement by Ontario to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. At the outset let me say I think it is an admirable presentation, factual and objective, and I will not quarrel with anything specifically said, but what I want to do now, in view of the committee I have suggested be set up, is to fill in the background and for that purpose I would like to read from this submission. I am reading, firstly, from the introduction, Mr. Speaker.

The future expansion of Canada will be created by growth in total production and in output per man in the industries in which Canadians work and by the rising living standards which such production makes possible. Only by such expansion will the present high rates of natural

increase be maintained and immigrants attracted. The production of cheap raw materials from rich natural resources, their processing and transportation to export markets, have been the main basis of the high output per man already achieved.

The nature of the industrial growth of the United States throws much light on the factors which have brought about Ontario's industrial development.

Perhaps the most conspicuous feature of the American industrial scene is the extreme concentration of the more complex forms of manufacturing in two great industrial belts, one along the Atlantic coast from Massachusetts to Pennsylvania and the other in the states which lie between the Ohio River and the Great Lakes.

Industries which process raw materials or which provide urban areas with commercial commodities and services are, of course, spread all over the United States where mineral deposits have been found or cities have grown up, but what is phenomenal is the degree to which the more durable goods, and the machines by which they are made and transported, are manufactured in these two regions.

It is relevant here to seek to understand the reasons for the great growth of manufacturing in the states just to the south of us, since they obviously bear on the situation in southern Ontario. Transportation, cheap and accessible, is perhaps the specific asset of every great manufacturing area. Fuel, power, capital and men all follow great industries; but industry itself seeks out areas blessed by nature or history with exceptionally good transportation facilities.

In addition, a soil and climate well suited to the mixed farming which produces at low cost the perishable goods required by large communities, level land in plenty to allow for growth, and an abundance of fresh water for industry and residential living—all these reduce the cost of

manufacturing and increase the attraction of the area for the working population.

As the years pass, a rapidly increasing number of Canadians will seek employment in the manufacturing and service industries of our great urban centres.

For the creation of an industrial belt whose industries have very high levels of production per man, private enterprise and capital are not enough; governments must today play a vital role. To low-cost production, they may contribute directly by carefully planned and controlled urban growth and a well-designed and adequate network of highways, roads, railroads and other transportation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to do is point out that the introduction of this submission would suggest we are becoming, in every sense of the word, a manufacturing province, and lest there be any doubt of it, let me simply refer briefly to pages 34 and 41 of this same submission.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to read a great many statistics unnecessarily, but on page 34 we find that, in 1946, the net value of production by classes of industries was broken down basically as follows: manufacturing \$1,659 million, agriculture \$405 million, mining \$107 million, forestry \$54 million, and others \$250 million. In 1953, manufacturing \$4,130 million, agriculture \$536 million, mining \$185 million, forestry \$103 million and others \$1,028 million.

The percentage breakdown in 1953 was as follows: the net value of production from manufacturing was 69 per cent. of the total net value of all of our production in Ontario. Agriculture was 9 per cent., mining 3 per cent., forestry 1.7 per cent., and others 17.2 per cent.

Nobody will quarrel with those figures at all. The only reason I am giving them is to demonstrate, lest there be any doubt, the dominant significance of the manufacturing industry in our economic life at the present time.

There are some things which give us concern. For example, I am not sure of the exact reference but certainly, in this

submission, the point is made that whereas our population is increasing each year by approximately 3 per cent., the fact is our working class or working force population is decreasing and by 1965, within the next 10 years, we are going to reach a situation where the labour force is going to form a smaller part of our total population than at any time since 1901.

That is something we must take into consideration, and about which we should do something. It may be that immigration is the answer. After 1965, our population will again take advantage of the fact that a great many young people born in recent years will go into the industrial force and it will build itself up, but between now and 1965, we will have "tough going," and I suggest we must do something about it.

I want to make reference to another fact today, which I believe is referred to on one of the pages to which I have already referred, page 41, which demonstrates a very interesting chart. It is a personal income per capita chart for the Province of Ontario, and it is not given in the normal way where you take dollars, as such, in their inflated manner, but the dollars here are, between 1935 and 1939, standard dollars in each instance.

We find our personal income per capita in 1939 was just under \$500. Then between 1939 and 1946, it rose to \$710. From 1946 to 1954, it increases to only \$740. In other words, the point I am making is on a standard dollar—if there is such a term. Our personal income is no longer increasing at any fantastic rate, and it becomes obvious, it seems to me, that we can no longer look to personal income, as such, to help us increase our revenue as we may be required to do. We must look to other sources, and I suggest to you the source to which we have to look is this dominant manufacturing source to which I have made reference.

I agree entirely with the suggestion we have to build roads, make ready, and prepare the groundwork for industrial manufacturing development, but it seems to me something which flows from that



proposition is that after industry has been established and put on its feet, we can expect some revenue from industry which we have assisted.

May I make this suggestion in that respect? We have heard a great deal about the financial and fiscal arrangements between Ontario and Ottawa. There have been references to the suggestion that maybe too much is being asked of Ontario. I say that I wish the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and the delegation going to Ottawa the best of luck, and I am sure everybody in this House hopes and expects that they will argue for Ontario, but I disagree with them in one respect.

Ottawa, it seems to me, has given them an alternative and has said, "You can either come into this scheme or stay out of it." If we are to look to manufacturing—and I think there is something to be said for it—maybe we should stay out of the scheme; maybe it would be better for Ontario to collect its own taxes. If the hon. members who attend in Ottawa so feel, I think it is their statesmanlike duty to say so, and to actually make the collections themselves. I realize politically it is dangerous, and undesirable, but I think the vital statistics of our economic status demonstrate we must give real thought to it, and acknowledge the facts of life, as it were, as stated in this submission, with which I concur, as I am sure does everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, one more point with regard to manufacturing and the dominant significance of it. Again, in this respect, I do not want to make any political capital, but I do think something should be done to assure that we process our raw materials more than we are doing at the present time. If our objective is to build up manufacturing industries, to bring people in to populate our areas, and to man our manufacturing factories, then certainly it is desirable we keep as much of the real work of this province in the province, as far as possible.

I realize eventually we will have to export. Certainly that is good and desirable, but I suggest that in many in-

dustries, and particularly in the mining industry or the iron industry as it is developing at the present time, we should take concrete steps to assure that the products of these mines, and our iron ore deposits, are processed and manufactured in Ontario, as far as possible, and as effectively as possible. It will have the effect of building our economy, instead of permitting these valuable ores and raw materials to be exported immediately they are taken from the ground.

We have the great pulp and paper industry. I acknowledge it is desirable that we send this material to the United States as quickly as we are doing at the present time. This submission, or any analysis, will tell you this is serving a real purpose in our economy, and I have no reference to that industry, but I do have reference to such things as our prospective iron deposits. It seems to me we must give concrete thoughts to securing protection against the exportation of these materials, but see they are processed as much as possible in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, continuing with this economic survey to which I have referred, I would like to speak for just a moment on our municipal affairs. I think everybody will basically agree that the municipal problem is becoming more unrealistic every day, when the additional costs of municipal government are required to be financed by real estate. More and more is required to be paid by real estate owners than before, and there is no relationship at the present time between those costs and real estate owned, as there was years ago.

Today there are all sorts of things done by our municipalities, in the way of public welfare and services, which have no reference whatsoever to property owning, and I think it is a problem we must refer to frankly and do something about.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to refer to my favourite author. Mr. Speaker, this again is the reference to 1944:

We now come to the all-important question of a sweeping revision of our whole system of real estate taxation, so that the owning and improvement of homes and farm land, which are the very foundation of our society, will not be discouraged by excessive taxation. In fairness it should be stated that the plight of real estate has been recognized by previous administrations and since about the year 1925 there has been a very marked trend on the part of the province to assume obligations which were formerly charged against the municipalities.

Despite the betterment of the municipal position, it has been felt that more drastic action should be taken. Following is the actual wording of the policy of this government as enunciated by the present hon. Prime Minister on July 9, 1943:

"There will be a sweeping revision of our whole system of real estate taxation so that the owning and improvement of homes and farm land, which are the very foundation of our society, will not be discouraged by excessive taxation. As an initial step in that direction the Provincial Government will assume at least 50 per cent. of the school taxes now charged against real estate."

The problem of real estate taxation is many sided. The first step this government is pledged to take is regarding the cost of education. It must be borne in mind that a reduction in municipal taxation means, generally, an increase in provincial taxation. This problem has often been discussed in this House. In the first speech which I made in the House, in 1938, I advocated the transfer of large amounts of taxation from the municipal field to the provincial field. In 1939, when acting as Opposition financial critic, I stated:

"Real estate represents an investment of some \$3 billion in Ontario. By reason of unscientific and unjust taxation it is practically stagnant. On

its salability and income productivity depends the success of building and construction trades with all their enormous potential employment and industrial possibilities."

At the time I pointed out that this would involve the imposition of many million dollars in extra provincial taxation and I suggested:

"That the province take over a very large proportion of the charges at present burdening the municipalities. I am aware that this is a great problem and that it would involve some difficult readjustments. If municipal taxes were reduced by one-third, it would cost the province approximately \$35 million. Such a readjustment of taxation should not be attempted in a haphazard manner. A commission should be appointed immediately to explore fully the whole matter."

In order to give a measure of relief and yet to assure the orderly fulfilment of not only the initial step in regard to the cost of education but the whole question of a sweeping revision of our system of real estate taxation, the following 3 points have been decided upon:

1. With a view to evolving a solution of the problems outlined, and particularly assuring to the owners of real estate: (a) a reduction in taxation equal to the amount of taxation assumed by the province; (b) that the reduction in municipal taxation be spread equitably among all municipalities, that the whole question of real estate taxation including the cost of education be referred to a Royal Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those words, I agree 100 per cent. They were said in 1944. They were good then, and they are good now, but the unfortunate part again is that in the interval they have not been implemented. I suggest to hon. members today that, in spite of the government's contention it is paying more and more dollars to the municipalities, the fact is they are inflated dollars, and

I suggest the municipalities are no better off than they were, as the result of those additional dollars.

I am not suggesting they have not built things with them. In that respect, they did, but they are in just as difficult a financial position today as they were in 1944. All we have to do is talk to a mayor or reeve of a municipality and he will tell you unquestionably they are up against the worst financial position they have ever been.

Over the week-end I had an opportunity of speaking to several people who had experience in this field. They told me that actually in certain areas they are faced with increased assessments, after they have effected an equalization programme of increased assessment for tax levy of something like 20 per cent.

The fact of the matter is that we should forthwith set up this Royal Commission which was suggested in 1944. I suggest it be a Royal Commission and not a committee of this House because, after all, the difficult relationship of municipal-provincial taxation is not something concerning which we can be judge and jury. We must give the municipalities the opportunity of expressing their thoughts, and to have some dominant say, and it seems to me the only way we will attain that is by means of a Royal Commission.

I suggest to this House that late as it is, it is certainly a better time to do it than never to do it at all. And I further suggest to this House that the sooner that is done, and a realistic approach is taken, the better off our fiscal arrangements will be between the municipalities and the province. After all, the hon. Provincial Treasurer acknowledged the other day—and I agree with him—that in many respects we are our brothers' keepers, and it is a good thing on the Dominion-provincial level to help our weaker provinces; then if that be good sense, it is equally good common sense to apply it to the provincial-municipal level.

The principle of subsidies, Dominion-provincial wise, has nothing to do with it. After Confederation, we had sub-

sidies of various kinds from the Dominion Government. They were revised in 1907, and again revised, and new suggestions made in the Rowell-Sirois report, and many of the suggestions have been undertaken.

I say the time has come to undertake the same programme on a provincial-municipal level, and the sooner we do, the sooner we will accomplish something realistic, because our municipal taxes are continuing to go up and up, out of control, in spite of the fact that we are receiving more dollars. I do not think the receiving of more dollars is the answer; I think the answer is we must assume more of the responsibilities of municipal government in their entirety, and when we do, we will accomplish some means by which municipalities can finance themselves in a more intelligent way.

In this respect, I have only one additional suggestion to make, and that is in the matter of unconditional grants. We acknowledge the desirability of receiving from the Dominion Government a lump-sum payment, something which comes pre-planned. We have an accurate idea of what we are going to receive, but that information is not available at the provincial-municipal level.

In connection with municipal grants; they are paid on a per capita basis, the municipality receives a basic amount of \$1.50 per capita, and I suggest they be revised to this extent:

"The unconditional grants are paid on per capita basis with all municipalities receiving a basic amount of \$1.50 per capita. In recognition of the larger expenditures that municipalities with larger populations are required to make in providing welfare services, social services, the administration of justice, and other services for its inhabitants, an additional grant is paid to all municipalities having a population of over 2,000.

"The additional grants range from 10 cents per capita in municipalities with populations of over 2,000 and not exceeding 5,000 to \$2.50 per capita in municipalities with populations of over



750,000. The result is that the smallest municipality receives \$1.50 per capita and the largest receives \$4.

"Consideration should be given to paying all municipalities a like amount. The fact that a basic rate of \$1.50 for all municipalities is recognized bears out the idea that a more equitable distribution warrants consideration.

"If all municipalities were paid the \$4 rate it would tend to bring the standard of living of smaller municipalities up to those of the larger centres. If the smaller municipalities received a larger grant they could provide some of the services which they are now unable to afford. More funds would be made available in the municipalities for roads and public works and improvements which, in turn, would provide a better system of roads and at the same time provide more work and money for the inhabitants.

"If the municipalities were able to put a hard surface on more of their roads, it would save thousands of dollars in the future as well as provide better roads. At present, they can afford to put only gravel on the roads; the gravel is quickly dissipated and has to be replaced from time to time and requires continual grading.

"If part of the unconditional grants were used to lower the municipal taxes it would recompense the inhabitants for the services which they are denied.

"The additional cost to the Province of Ontario to pay equal per capita grants of \$4 to all municipalities would be approximately \$7.46 million.

Population (1954-55)

4,773,703 x \$4 ..... \$19,094,812.00

Amount paid (1954-55) 11,638,156.73

Additional cost ..... \$ 7,456,655.27"

I think the inauguration of this type of thing would be to translate our type of thinking from terms of a Dominion-provincial level to those at a provincial-municipal level, and my suggestions in this respect are, firstly, as was suggested in 1944, that we set up a Royal Commission; secondly, that we consider the advisability of more individual grants, thus giving the opportunity to munici-

palities to know in advance what they are going to receive, and the less fortunate municipalities would then have an opportunity to bring themselves up to a standard of living we expect for all of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the next reference I want to make—and then to make my concluding remarks—is simply to compare some of the features of the Michigan State Budget. I am quite prepared to acknowledge at the outset that it is difficult to make a comparison. After all, Michigan is not Ontario; many of their sources of revenue may be different from ours, and there are other factors at variance.

The reason I chose Michigan was this: when I examined the population of Michigan, I found their population increased 15 per cent. from 1950 to 1956, increasing from 6 million to 7 million. Our population is increasing at the rate of 3.5 per cent. which, translated into the Michigan situation, is almost identical.

When we look at individual incomes in Michigan, and the percentage of increase, we find, in 1950, the individual income amounted to \$9 billion. It is estimated at \$15 billion in 1956, an increase of 62 per cent. In connection with Ontario—and acknowledging that Ontario's individual income started at a lower figure, and always has been lower—the increase has been approximately the same. Likewise the per capita income in Michigan, in 1950, was \$1,500; in 1956-1957, it rises to \$2,100, an increase of 40 per cent. Our own increase in that respect was from \$1,186 to \$1,567, almost exactly 40 per cent.

The state expenditure, compared to individual income in Michigan, is 5.8 per cent. I think ours is about 5 per cent. That is the relationship between the individual income and the cost of state or provincial governments. We spend approximately 5 per cent. of our individual income on governments in Ontario. In Michigan, it was 5.8 per cent. I think it is now 5.6 per cent.

It is for these reasons I suggest this comparison. May I read just briefly from the Governor's Budget Address

to the State Legislature of Michigan on January 23, 1956:

This is the eighth Budget which I have presented to the Michigan Legislature. My message of January 12, 1956, reviewed many of the more important accomplishments of the past 7 years. Before discussing the proposed Budget for fiscal 1956-57, I would like to draw your attention again to some of the truly remarkable changes since I presented my first Budget for 1949-50:

Speaker, let me state that the whole purpose of my reference to Michigan has been simply to set the stage for this particular comparison.

In the appendix to our Budget, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has been kind enough, as in previous years, to prepare a circle and demonstrate where our money is going and in what proportion. This, then, is the comparison I want to make.

The net ordinary and net capital expenditures in Ontario for the fiscal year

#### FACTORS OF RECENT GROWTH IN MICHIGAN

| Factor                                       |                       | Estimated |          |          |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
|  |                       | 1949-50   | 1956-57  | % Change |
| Population .....                             | (millions)            | 6.4       | 7.4      | 15.6     |
| Individual income .....                      | (billions of dollars) | 9.6       | 15.6     | 62.1     |
| State expenditures .....                     | (millions of dollars) | 556.5     | 875.0    | 57.2     |
| Per capita income .....                      | (dollars)             | 1,500.00  | 2,102.00 | 40.0     |
| State expenditure to individual income ..... | (per cent.)           | 5.8       | 5.6      | .4       |

Most obvious, of course, has been the tremendous upsurge in population and its terrific impact upon our schools, highways and practically all governmental activities. From 6.4 million in 1949, we have jumped to a currently estimated 7,225,000, which may be expected to increase to about 7.4 million by 1957.

Along with this great growth in population, Michigan has enjoyed an unprecedented expansion of its economy. Total individual income will have jumped from \$9.6 billion to an estimated all-time high of \$15.6 billion in 1956-57. Although a considerable portion of this increase simply reflects an element of higher prices and inflation, we have enjoyed a substantial real growth in income.

The reason for making that reference is that it is the type of growth to which we in Ontario have become accustomed.

Therefore, it occurred to me that it would be advisable to look to the division of their revenues and their expenditures and compare them with that of Ontario. So that I will make myself absolutely clear about this, Mr.

1955-56, that is the period ended on March 31, 1956, demonstrates that 30 per cent. of our expenditures went to highways. In Michigan the corresponding figure is 20 per cent. When we look at education, we find that Ontario's expenditure is 19.6 per cent., as compared with Michigan's 36 per cent.

The purpose I have in mind is simply to draw to the attention of hon. members those two significant things. I do not think any one specific thing can be concluded absolutely from that reference, but it does demonstrate the importance which another comparable jurisdiction is placing on education. In fairness to the government, may I point out if hon. members examine the Michigan Budget, it will be found that Ontario's public welfare services, as we normally refer to them, percentage-wise are just about the same as those in Michigan, but there is this terrific difference as between highways and education, the allocation for which is just about reversed between the two jurisdictions.

MR. A. J. CHILD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member if Michigan gets federal aid?

MR. WINTERMEYER: I am quite prepared to agree that they do get some federal aid, but I was surprised how little they receive in relation to their entire Budget. If the hon. member for Wentworth is interested, I shall be glad to give him the Budget which I received from the Michigan Legislature. I hesitate to go into the point in too much detail, and to be quite frank, I cannot tell right now how much federal aid they do receive. I am prepared to acknowledge there is some differentiation, but on examining their total expenditures—and we are talking of capital and revenue—the comparison appears to be appropriate, and as I mentioned, there is the fact that we allocate 30 per cent. to highways and 19.6 per cent. to education, whereas in Michigan the situation is practically reversed.

While we are on the subject of Michigan—and this is my concluding remark in that respect, Mr. Speaker—I would like to draw to your attention that they have, in regard to their total, something which is analogous to our gross and net debt. I was somewhat at a loss to follow it through, but I did call the State Treasurer yesterday and asked for an explanation and these are the figures I received. In Michigan, at this time, their net debt is \$247,338,000, but their gross debt is only \$527 million, and he said, very frankly, that their gross debt is a little different from ours in that it represents, not direct obligations, but obligations of really independent bodies, such as the Hydro-Electric Power Commission would be, if my suggestion is followed through that it be divorced. Their real debt, therefore, is only \$247 million.

I do not wish to take up too much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but before making my concluding remarks may I simply say a word about university bursaries. In that respect, I think I can do no better than quote the very commendable words of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter) last Thursday afternoon:

In this Budget, there is a special emphasis. That emphasis is upon education. In addition to the unprecedented increase in the grants to schools, it lays special emphasis upon the universities.

It was not so many years ago that industry and business generally looked somewhat askance at university graduates. Parents who missed the opportunity for higher education themselves now fully realize that it is an advantage and they wish it for their children.

The programme of development in this province needs graduates of the universities for its fulfilment.

In our urgent need for persons of special scientific training, let us not overlook the fact that the great issues that arise from time to time in our country are human issues. We are faced constantly with the clash of ideas. It is in the universities that men and women learn the discipline of study, learn to discuss opinions from all viewpoints, learn to separate the true from the false.

It is there that they can best gain a perspective of the vast sweep of history and come face to face with the thoughts of the great minds of all the ages. It is there that they may learn to live in the discipline of liberty. From thence may be derived some understanding of the basic problems and the causes that lie behind the conflict of ideas.

It is not the competition for scientific supremacy wherein the danger lies. It is in the conflict of ideas. Science is essential for our material progress and the defence of our liberty. The threat to our safety and our liberty comes from ideas which cannot be reconciled.

The ultimate value of our universities lies in their breadth of vision, in their independence, in their liberty. We have a more pressing need for them than ever before. The major human issues will be resolved, if they ever will be resolved, by knowledge, disciplined understanding, and the wisdom that flows from these.



Now, Mr. Speaker, those are commendable words and the hon. Provincial Treasurer is to be commended for them. We should all agree with them. They set up an objective for all of us and, to the extent that the Budget supports the hon. Provincial Treasurer's ideals in the form of university grants, I will agree that he implements those thoughts and that policy.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in one definite respect that programme, so eloquently set out in the reference which I have read, is going to collapse completely, and be unimportant and untenable unless we can provide bursaries in sufficient numbers and with sufficient dollars to assure that the boys and girls who are qualified to pass the academic standards have the opportunity to go to a university. I repeat what I said at the time of my address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that it seems to me that Ontario has today to give leadership in this direction. I am not suggesting they have to give millions or billions of dollars; all they have to do is set up a fund, and use that fund for the simple purpose of persuading industry to join in.

Look at what the Atkinson Foundation has done. There are other people and other worthwhile organizations, which are willing and ready to do something of the same nature, and I suggest that the government has not given them the leadership nor the opportunity to put money into funds which will ensure income and tuition to our boys and girls.

As I said at the outset, I do not think that is a matter of many millions of dollars at all. By and large, the money the government contributes can be used simply to educate industrialists, and business, in the real need and the real responsibility they have towards the education of our young people. Because, Mr. Speaker, as has been said time and time again, they are after all the beneficiaries, and it is only a pre-payment on an asset they will have in the future, and I am sure if our money is used for the purpose of bringing this out into

the open, and to the attention of people generally, the government will be amazed and surprised at the support it will receive.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion now before the House "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply" be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"But this House regrets that there was no announcement in the Budget Address that a select committee of the House would be appointed to examine into and report upon:

"(a) The economic survey of the future economic position of the Province of Ontario with particular reference to the financial relationship as between the municipalities, the province, and the Federal Government.

"(b) The financial relationship that commissions and boards created by this Legislature should bear to the Provincial Treasury.

"(c) The advisability of maintaining the present Highway Reserve Fund.

"(d) The most amazing discrepancies between the estimated and actual revenues and expenditures in the last decade."

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I must warn you at the outset that I cannot summon up the same degree of Christian forbearance in approaching this Budget as did the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer).

HON. MR. FROST: He was pretty effective, I would say.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister thinks he is effective and I will not dispute that with him at all. The hon. member for Waterloo North found many things in the Budget, in fact, most of the Budget, with which he was apparently in general agreement. I must say that while there were some things in the Budget—obviously since we are dealing with the same province—with which I was in agreement, there was, however,

a great deal with which I am in disagreement. I want to dwell upon that, and I hope that I can do so without getting the picture too seriously out of balance.

The hon. member for Waterloo North described it as a "good Budget." I think it was a good businessman's budget, in terms of meeting the business needs of this province, but without giving the necessary emphasis to what might be described as the "human needs."

The hon. Prime Minister will perhaps be very much interested to know that shortly after I became the leader of the Ontario CCF Party, I dropped into his office and was presented with what has become one of my treasured volumes. It is a beautifully leather-bound volume containing the first 8 or 10 Budget speeches made by the hon. Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: I will make sure that the hon. member gets all of them.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister may be flattered to know that these have become a sort of substitute for my "whodunits." Some people may think it is rather a dull substitute for "whodunits," but I assure hon. members that there are some characteristics in which they are exactly parallel, because it was a problem of finding out exactly "who done it," where the money came in and where it went—the kind of procedure the hon. member for Waterloo North apparently experienced when he tried to analyze the Highway Reserve Fund. I assure him I have had exactly the same experience.

The big surprise in the Budget, as the hon. member for Waterloo North indicated, is that it follows the example of all the Budgets in past years, which have been spelled out as though they were going to balance; and then, surprise of surprises, we discovered at the end of each year that we had great surpluses. These surpluses became so embarrassing that various means had to be sought to dispose of them, so that they would not become too evident to the public.

It was that situation which gave birth to the Highway Reserve Fund, which has been in existence now for some 3 or 4 years. It is that kind of approach to the Budget which has led this government for years to restrict its long-term commitments, particularly in terms of social assistance, with the result that the Province of Ontario has the lowest per capita social assistance load of any province in this nation.

They did it, Mr. Speaker, with the hope—and with the kind of economic times that we have had in the last 10 years, that hope was usually realized—that at the end of the year they would, with these restricted commitments, find themselves with a surplus they could dispose of as they thought most suitable. And on the eve of an election I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I am being unkind when I say that political considerations played a major role in deciding what was done to dispose of that surplus.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are not in that position now.

MR. MacDONALD: No, but the Highway Reserve Fund, in some respects, I think, can be described as the "grand-daddy of all pork barrels."

HON. MR. PORTER: We have no election facing us now.

MR. MacDONALD: It was built up on the eve of the last election, and I can remember the government—I have forgotten whether it was by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Allan) or who it was—just prior to the last election, stating that as a result of the "scandal" they were nailing down exactly where each little item was being spent, dollar for dollar, project for project; and then, casually tucked in at the end, was an item which indicated that there were \$16 million being put in for items which might emerge.

And, as I was travelling across the province, I discovered reeves—particularly if they happened to be of the right political persuasion—urging municipalities to put in their requests to see if they could get their share of the \$16 million, on the eve of the election.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that fund was to build permanent roads, as the hon. member for Waterloo North said.

MR. MacDONALD: Roads which are promised on the eve of an election may be permanent, but sometimes their permanency is a pretty ethereal proposition, as many people discovered after the election was over.

HON. MR. FROST: I would not say that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we carried out our promises to all.

MR. MacDONALD: With regard to the government's Budget and how it has handled this money down through the years, there are two comments I would like to make. The first I borrow from my hon. friend in the front benches over here, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Dunbar). The hon. member for Waterloo North referred to the fact that there was a sort of "sugar bowl" approach, hoping that at the end of the year there would be something left in the sugar bowl which the government could use.

Hon. members will be interested to know that about a year ago, in the course of a debate in the House, when an hon. member on the Liberal front benches was "twitting" the government as to whether or not they had brought in the special educational grant, and more for highways, and so on, and if they had exhausted all that might be available on the eve of election, the hon. Provincial Secretary came out with a very apt expression, "There is still a great deal in the bottom of the old sock yet."

In other words, there are these reserves, beyond the permanent commitments, which can be used as seen fit, and the only difference between the hon. Provincial Secretary and other hon. members of the government is that he is rather frank as regards the "old sock", and the purposes for which it is used. The hon. Prime Minister, for whom I have the highest personal

respect—in fact, that respect grows day by day as I watch him lead the government—I have no illusions but that he is a "political smoothie"—is he shocked?

HON. MR. FROST: Nothing the hon. member says shocks me.

MR. MacDONALD: In this sort of thing in the past, the hon. Prime Minister has fooled many people for a long time, but there is a possibility that the people will find out.

Another thing I want to bring out is this, that I think when it comes to financing, an apt description of this government is that it is a "hugger-mugger" government. Now, Mr. Speaker, you may think that I am maligning this government, but "hugger-mugger" is spelled "h-u-g-g-e-r-m-u-g-g-e-r"—

HON. MR. PORTER: There is a hyphen in between.

MR. MacDONALD: Not necessarily. This is really not maligning the government, it is a word which comes from a most high and most respectable source. The first time I came across its use was in a judgment by Chief Justice Duff in 1932, about the time the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) was bringing up that very interesting mining court petition. It was repeated by Justices Rand and Kellock in their recent judgment in regard to the immigration case, which has been most interestingly decided in Ottawa.

You will be interested to know that the definition of this term is "to conceal, to hush up, to proceed in a sort of a secret manner", a "hugger-mugger government."

From what we have seen of the Highway Reserve Fund, it is exactly that kind of financing. The hon. member who preceded me said he looked into it, and I do not wonder he could not find out where the funds went, because the fact of the matter is, they were used for capital purposes, and sometimes for current purposes.



HON. MR. FROST: Never. The hon. member is quite wrong.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, I will go back into the Budgets of about 3 years ago, which I have not right at my fingertips and, like the other day when the hon. Prime Minister denied that he had made a statement, I will be able to face him with something from his own speeches.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the fund was never used for anything but capital purposes.

MR. MacDONALD: I will take a "rain check" on that little item, and we will deal with it sometime later, when I have a chance to look into one of the hon. Prime Minister's earlier statements.

HON. MR. FROST: You are always out in the rain, and always "all wet."

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister just got one of his faithful flock to applaud him on that one.

I want to try to deal with this Budget with a certain line of reasoning, because in trying to cope with the Budget, one is approaching such a large part of the provincial affairs, the financing of the province, that it is impossible to deal with all aspects of it. There is one particular aspect of it that I want to try and touch upon, and elaborate upon from start to finish.

I think it is rather interesting to take a look at the theory the government is now expounding, and upon which the hon. Prime Minister expounded, in his preview of the Budget, at the end of the pipe line debate the other day, and which was elaborated upon by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. The theory is that this government is the victim of its own prosperity, that because we have very great responsibilities with our developing economy, we in this province—the richest province in this nation—are not in a position to provide for our people some of the services that other less wealthy provinces have been able to provide.

The hon. Prime Minister reiterated that statement for the second or third time the other day. Let me emphasize this: I am not unmindful of the fact that the province, with the kind of expanding economy we have in Ontario, is obviously going to be faced with what might be described as "growing pains", and with the problem of servicing this great expansion. However, I repeat what I said in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that I believe it is nothing less than ludicrous to try to present the richest province in this nation in a position of not being able to cope with its own needs, that it is a victim of its own prosperity.

I said then, and I repeat now—to try to put this in an analogous form—that to say the Province of Ontario is "a victim of its own prosperity" is just about as ludicrous as the richest man in town claiming that he cannot meet his own needs, because those needs are so great, therefore, he is looking for more assistance. For instance, he is not in a position to help his aged parents, he has to reduce his contributions, he has to trim his contribution to meet the educational needs of his family. I think that is obviously a nonsensical kind of approach, and I would suggest if it is pursued much further, it is going to present this province in a ludicrous light.

Obviously the answer is that, in a province such as the Province of Ontario, there has to be some re-assessing of our wealth and revenue sources, to meet the needs; the answer is not to go around singing the "Queen's Park lament," as I have described it.

Mr. Speaker, let us face this fact, that the Province of Ontario today represents about one-half of the productive wealth of this nation. In other words, the Province of Ontario has today a productive wealth of approximately \$12 billion to \$13 billion every year. I think it is interesting to bring this into perspective by reminding ourselves that this is greater than the national wealth of Canada for the year 1945, at the end of the war, and it is twice the whole of the national wealth of Canada in 1939, at

the beginning of the war. We have this wealth within the Province of Ontario, and I think it is necessary for us to take a look at how we are using that wealth, and whether we are meeting the legitimate, human needs of the people.

I have mentioned it already, but just let me repeat it once again because it is a basic fact in getting this government's so-called programme of human betterment into perspective—that on the basis of this document supplied to the delegates who attended the Dominion-provincial conference last October Ontario stands at the foot of the list of provinces in the matter of social assistance. On a per capita basis, it has a smaller social assistance case load than any other province across the nation. This is the result of the budgeting which has gone on down through the years—restricting these long-term social service commitments for meeting the needs of the people.

The two illustrations I want to use are familiar to the House, and the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer) has already touched upon the first one, and that is, the needs of our old-age pensioners. Mr. Speaker, I was told by a member of the Cabinet the other day, for what reason I do not know or I have forgotten, that I should hang my head in shame. I say to this government that it should hang its head in shame.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Please do not steal my words.

MR. MacDONALD: Any government which brings in a Budget in excess of \$400 million in the face of comments from all Parties—including its own “back benchers”—and does nothing to meet the urgent needs of our aged citizens in this province at a time when it is spending less than \$100,000 a year on old-age pensioners, should hang its head in shame.

We have, as I stated in the debate on the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in the Province of Ontario today something approximating 300,000 old-age pensioners. Exactly how many

are facing abject poverty because of the fact they are trying to live on \$40 a month, I do not know, but I am certain there are tens of thousands, and this government has so “rigged” the situation in terms of who might receive the pension and when, that today there are only 1,795 old-age pensioners in the Province of Ontario who are receiving a supplement to their old-age pension.

Yet this government brings in a Budget for the second year nudging or in excess of \$400 million, and has nothing to offer beyond those “peanuts” of about \$100,000 as a contribution to meeting the needs of old-age pensioners.

The second item I want to speak about is the question of education. The government in the last year or two, because of the mounting pressure with regard to its inadequate contribution to education, has been doing a rather skilful job in “padding the Budget,” so to speak. For example, years ago there was never any suggestion, when discussing education, that the money spent on agricultural colleges should be considered as part of the Education Budget. It is becoming a regular pattern now that we include these figures to make the figure as high as possible. Let me say frankly I am not objecting to it.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is separated.

MR. MacDONALD: Sure, it is separated.

HON. MR. PORTER: There is no attempt to do as the hon. member suggests.

MR. MacDONALD: I am not objecting because, looking at the very urgent problem of meeting our higher education needs in this province, I feel our agricultural colleges are included in the institutes of higher learning, therefore, I am not objecting.

HON. MR. PORTER: Then what is the hon. member “babbling” about?

MR. MacDONALD: Do not get overly anxious.

HON. MR. FROST: We are waiting expectantly for the words to fall from the hon. member's lips.

MR. MacDONALD: The total education figure is \$117 million of which \$9 million is spent on agricultural colleges. \$24 million is now being contributed this year to universities. A great deal of that is in the Supplementary Estimates, which are used to get rid of a surplus which might prove embarrassing at the end of the year.

HON. MR. FROST: Was that not a good way to spend it?

MR. MacDONALD: But the point is—without minimizing for the moment the magnitude of the problem in coping with the higher educational needs of this province, most people are thinking in terms of public, separate and secondary schools. The Province of Ontario today is contributing to our public, separate and secondary schools—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Be careful, you have stopped the clock up there.

MR. MacDONALD: It just shows how slow the time goes by when I am speaking, Mr. Speaker.

After you have deducted these contributions to higher education, the point I want to draw to the attention of the House is that the amount the government is contributing to what is normally thought of by the average person in the street as "our educational problem," is \$84 million in grants to public, separate and secondary schools.

HON. MR. FROST: How much has that increased over last year?

MR. MacDONALD: I am coming to that. Do not be too anxious.

HON. MR. FROST: But the hon. member makes us so expectant, we would really like to know.

MR. MacDONALD: I am drawing my information in the next moment from tables on page 58 and 59, with regard to finances in our schools, to be

found in the latest annual report of the hon. Minister.

These tables provide figures over a number of years, and the interesting thing is that in 1945, shortly after the government made this famous promise of meeting 50 per cent. of the over-all cost of education in the province, the provincial grants to education were \$26.5 million. The over-all expenditures for education were \$62 million.

HON. MR. FROST: That was not in 1945.

MR. MacDONALD: Right, that was in 1945.

HON. MR. FROST: If the hon. member means after the 50 per cent. came into effect, that is right.

MR. MacDONALD: Not after the 50 per cent. came into effect, because the point is, that was the peak this government ever reached, and they were meeting only 42 per cent. in 1945.

HON. MR. FROST: 50 per cent. at that time.

MR. MacDONALD: Never 50 per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: Absolutely never, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at this table and see for yourself and if it goes up to 50 per cent. anywhere, I would be interested in seeing it.

The highest point this government ever reached in meeting educational needs by these grants was in 1945, when it contributed \$26.5 million out of an over-all expenditure of \$62 million, representing 42 per cent.

In 1953 the total grants were \$57.8 million out of a total expenditure of \$171.3 million, representing 33 per cent.

In 1954—the last year for which we have figures—in the recently-released report by the hon. Minister of Education, the total grants paid by this government were \$66.9 million out of an ex-



penditure of \$193 million, or 34 per cent.

What is happening this year? Here is where the "hugger-mugger" deal comes in and it is difficult to find figures. We know the government this year is spending \$84 million in grants. What will the total expenditures for education be this year? The over-all expenditure in our public, separate and secondary schools in the 1954 report which is the latest we have, was \$193.1 million. It is interesting to see that the 1954 figure represented an increased expenditure on education of \$23 million over the previous year.

I see no reason to believe that the figure is going to drop in the next two years, 1955 and 1956. It has undoubtedly increased. So let us assume in 1955, and 1956, the total expenditure on education will increase by \$23 million which will make an over-all expenditure in 1956 of \$240 million of which the government is meeting \$84 million in grants.

Mr. Speaker, that works out at 35 per cent. Therefore, in the last 3 years this government has met the over-all cost of education at the level most people think of—namely secondary, separate and public schools, to the extent of 33, 34 and 35 per cent.

This is the time for the hon. Prime Minister to say, "We are getting better all the time," because you are—by one per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member's figures are so wrong and his arithmetic is so bad, there is no reason for me to comment on it.

MR. MacDONALD: The interesting thing is for a year the government has been saying the figures are wrong, but they have not come up with the right figures. To go back to March 16, of last year—I know the date; I have used it a great deal across this province and in this House, and I have a very clear mental picture of it—just to show you how little they were meeting the over-all cost of education—

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member knows, of course, The Department of Education has approved costs. That does not deter any school board from spending more if they wish to, but if they are spending more they have to meet the costs themselves, and those costs are included in the figures which the hon. member is giving.

This morning I had a visit from members of a school board requesting 12 additional rooms in a secondary school. They will receive 75 per cent. of the costs of constructing and equipping these rooms.

I would say to the hon. member that the promise of 1943 has certainly been substantially carried out, and the people of this province believe that; they know it and that is why they voted for this government.

MR. MacDONALD: That is what was described a few moments ago as "political smoothie". But what the hon. Prime Minister says is not the case.

HON. MR. FROST: That is what the hon. member said last election and the people did not take him very seriously.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister uses the election results of last June to cover up a multitude of sins, but this is not the case. Certainly, the government does not accept all the expenditures of education. They are not in the grants, but when the promise was made in 1944, of 50 per cent., it did not rule out what are now described as a lot of frills.

I have a letter here from the Board of Education of the Township of York. They passed a resolution, and have asked my support for this issue. All I could do was to reply to them, and say "the government is continuing its policy of doing nothing." They were asking for grants to cover shop rooms and home economics in their schools. If this government was really fulfilling the 50 per cent. it claims to be the case, namely, that education is Ontario's

greatest problem, it would not have increased the expenditures on education in the last 3 or 4 years by only 50 per cent. while it was trebling its Highway Budget.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member that in the days to which the hon. member for Waterloo North referred, back in 1944, the total amount for education under this benevolent government was \$13 million. Today, it is \$117 million, which is contributed to education in this province.

MR. NIXON: Did that take into account the agricultural college, Mr. Speaker?

MR. OLIVER: What was the figure in 1930?

MR. MacDONALD: I thought this was fought out during the last election campaign, the comparison between 1955 and 1943.

HON. MR. FROST: When we campaigned last May and June, I think the amount was \$105 million; now, it is \$117 million. That does not include the agricultural college, and we have added on a considerable sum for that.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister's figures are completely "off the beam". Let me make this challenge to the government which has been "weaseling" all through this matter of educational grants. If the hon. Prime Minister will go back to March 16, and refer to *Hansard*, he will see where the government twisted and "weaseled" before it finally acknowledged it was not fulfilling its promises regarding grants for education.

The tables appear on pages 58 and 59, and I invite the hon. Prime Minister to take his pencil and make a calculation, and if he does, he will come up with the calculation that in 1953, the government contributed 33 per cent.; in 1954, 34 per cent., and in 1956, it is approximately 35 per cent. Those are the facts based on the hon. Prime Minister's own figures, and I ask him not to rise in his place and give us some more inaccurate figures.

HON. MR. MAPLEDORAM: Will the hon. member repeat those figures, please?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Will the hon. member tell us about the depression, in 1933?

MR. MacDONALD: I want to turn now to what will undoubtedly be a question raised by this government. If we are going to spend more money for social assistance, where will we get the money? I acknowledge that if any hon. member rises and says we should be spending more money he must recognize that this cannot be achieved by a sort of budgetary gymnastics, you cannot say you are not going to reduce the taxes, but will raise the services. That simply cannot be done.

I want to make 3 suggestions as to where I think we can get more money to meet these needs, such as, for example, the 50 per cent. of educational costs, instead of only 35 per cent. as of now.

The first place to secure more money is, of course, under the federal-provincial agreement, and I repeat to the hon. Prime Minister what I said to him during the one-day session held here in September, before he went to Ottawa the last time. God bless him when he goes down and begins to negotiate with those people, and I do hope the hon. Prime Minister can be as tough as possible—a great deal more tough than he was in connection with the pipe line. Do not give in so easily.

To come back to a point raised by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer), the Liberal spokesman, the dipping into the corporation and income taxes over the Province of Ontario is obviously one legitimate place from which we should raise more revenues. I am not suggesting an unco-operative approach, just tough bargaining. After we have argued and negotiated, my hope would be that some renewal of the tax rental agreements can be accepted for its obvious contribution to national unity.

But having secured whatever increase we can from the taxes rented to

the Federal Government, I suggest we take a look at the situation under our own control. I think there is one area in our Budget in the Province of Ontario which has been neglected far too long, and that is the industries which are based on the natural resources of this province, namely, our forest industry and our mining industry. To spell this out in round figures, may I say there are two groups of industries—

HON. MR. KELLY: Does that include gold mines?

MR. MacDONALD: I got the “gen” this week—

HON. MR. FROST: Did the hon. member say “gin” or “gen”?

MR. MacDONALD: I said “gen.” If the hon. Prime Minister had been a member of the Junior Service during the war, he would know that “gen” is a good Air Force term.

However, Mr. Speaker, if I may get back to the point I am attempting to make; here we have two groups of

industries based on natural resources, owned by the people of the Province of Ontario. They are, in effect, rented or leased to the people who happen to be developing them. Our forest resources today are producing approximately \$500 million a year, and I think the mining industry today is producing from the natural resources about \$500 million—as a matter of fact, this year I think it is up to \$578 million. In other words, we have a total productive wealth in these two groups of industries, based on resources owned by the people of the Province of Ontario, and rented to the people who are operating and exploiting them, amounting to approximately \$1,100 million.

Now, how much of that wealth is returned to the people of Ontario? Perhaps I should let the question rest over the supper hour.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the chair.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.







# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Tuesday, March 6, 1956  
Evening Session

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Tuesday, March 6, 1956**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. MacDonald .....            | 793 |
| Motion to resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to ..... | 810 |
| Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Roberts .....       | 810 |
| Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....                          | 824 |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1956

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, when we rose at the supper hour, I had indicated two or three areas in which I suggested this government should be spending more money. I then proceeded to face up to the legitimate question which the government might ask: just where are we going to raise this money? I was dealing with three potential areas of further revenue, one from the federal tax rental agreements, which are now in the process of renegotiation, and the second one, which I was in the midst of dealing with when we rose, namely, the suggestion that we are not bringing into the general revenue of the province, an equitable amount of money from the productive wealth of those industries which are built upon our natural resources, chiefly mining and our forest industries.

I pointed out, for example, that in round figures, our forest industries and our mining are today producing in excess of \$500 million, so that the two of them together represent a productive wealth of something in excess of \$1 billion a year. In fact, the latest figure for mining is \$578 million, so the overall figure is likely to be in excess of \$1,100 million.

I want the House for a moment to take a look at what is coming into the Provincial Treasury from this wealth produced from our property, so to speak, the resources belonging to the

people of the province, and rented or leased to the people who are developing them.

In the instance of mining, the latest figures, brought down in the Budget last Thursday, were that the total revenue coming in from mining was \$7.7 million, of which \$1.2 million is ploughed back through the Department of Mines, to service the industry. That means that the net revenue to the Provincial Treasury—to the people of Ontario for their general needs, from the mining industry—is approximately \$6½ million, out of a total productive wealth of \$578 million.

MR. G. C. WARDROPE (Port Arthur): Any labour?

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member for York South must remember that we get something by way of corporation tax from the rental agreements.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Provincial Treasurer is really "fast on the trigger." I know you get something from corporation tax, but my contention is that these industries are, in effect, paying to the people of the province of Ontario, \$7.7 million for their raw material, in other words, this \$7.7 million is their output for their raw material, equivalent, for example, to what the Steel Company of Canada would have to expend for its raw material, pig iron.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member cannot be serious.

MR. MacDONALD: Let me finish my argument, then if the hon. Provincial Treasurer really thinks he has a case, he can say something.

HON. MR. PORTER: They have to take it out of the ground.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

HON. MR. PORTER: The Steel Company buys it in its raw state, after it is taken out of the ground. There is no comparison at all. I never heard such nonsense.

MR. MacDONALD: About the only comment I get from the hon. Provincial Treasurer when he is angry is, "Such nonsense, such nonsense." We will have to get a record made of it.

HON. MR. PORTER: You have to repeat things to drive them home, sometimes.

MR. MacDONALD: This is the equivalent of their raw material cost, the equivalent of pig iron costs to a steel mill, the equivalent of a packer's costs when they buy the material from the farmers.

HON. MR. PORTER: No comparison whatsoever.

MR. MacDONALD: In other words, it is, quite apart from what they may be paying in terms of corporation tax to the Federal Government, and which comes back through the tax rental agreements. My contention is—and I suggest that while the hon. Provincial Treasurer may not be willing to accept it, there is validity in it—this is their raw material cost, in other words, this is what they are paying to the people of the province of Ontario for the right to exploit this wealth.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is an entirely different thing from what the Steel Company pays for its pig iron, or for its raw material from the mine. What the Steel Company pays is for the raw material after it has been taken

out of the ground, after people have dug for it and explored for it, and gone to the great expense of getting it out.

MR. MacDONALD: And the Steel Company takes it from that stage forward and processes it into some sort of a steel product. With the nickel or gold, they take it from the ground and process it into bullion form.

HON. MR. PORTER: The Steel Company only does half of it, which is quite a different thing. It is so completely different that this is just utter nonsense.

MR. MacDONALD: I can see how the government would be exorcized since they are receiving so little money from these people. Let us go back for a moment to the forest industries, last year the total amount of revenue raised from the forest industries of this province was \$19.7 million, of which \$17.1 million was ploughed back through the Department of Lands and Forests to service the industry, so once again the net revenue to the people of the Province of Ontario was \$2.6 million for industries whose productive wealth is in excess of \$500 million. Once again the revenue coming into the Provincial treasury to meet the general needs of the people of this province—educational needs, old-age pension supplement, which I cited before as illustrations tonight—the net revenue over and above what is ploughed back into these industries through the two governmental departments servicing them, is about \$9 million, from a total productive wealth of \$1,100 million. I suggested once again that is in the category of being just a bit ludicrous.

HON. MR. PORTER: They have to cut down the trees.

HON. MR. DALEY: They are employing men.

MR. MacDONALD: That is quite apart from thousands of men gaining employment; it is what they are paying to us for the right to exploit these resources. I suggest that the people of

the province of Ontario are entitled to receive more, and this government apparently is not willing to raise it. The interesting thing is that last fall when the pulp and paper companies raised their prices, and once again "gouged" the public as they have done on a number of occasions in recent years, to the point where in a neighbouring province they have "gone for" what I would not endorse—you do endorse it?

HON. MR. PORTER: I was going to ask a question but I changed my mind.

MR. MacDONALD: Very good. Here in the province of Ontario the thing that interests me is this. Going back to that authoritative journal, the *Globe and Mail*, in terms of what comes from the government, I have here a news story dated October 25, 1955, entitled, "Ontario may increase pulp fees." This is following the announcement, and the public furore it created, and I would like to quote three or four paragraphs to reveal the government's thinking and then I want to ask a few questions.

"The Ontario Government is taking a second look at stumpage fees being paid by the province's pulp and paper companies in the light of announced increases in newsprint prices and the high level of earnings enjoyed by many of the companies during the past five years.

"The Government believes that the time may now have arrived when it should look to industry to assume a greater share of the price of supporting the province's industrial structure.

"Treasury officials admit they are unable, at the moment, to reconcile the increase with the consistent high earnings which the paper companies have been reporting.

"In their haste to increase their prices, it seems the companies have overlooked this one important point so far as Ontario is concerned—the government has leaned backward in its concern for the welfare of these companies."

I'll say they have leaned over backwards; they have raised so little money from these companies; they are not raising enough to do a decent job to replenish the resources of this province. We have a totally inadequate programme in the Department of Lands and Forests to meet the economic expansion of this province, or to meet the social needs of this province, this government refuses to raise the fees. That brings me back to a question I raised the other day. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests became quite incensed, on a personal basis, and as far as that was concerned, I was willing to withdraw it. It is rather strange this government's close relationship with the pulp and paper companies, and with the mining companies. I was up north last week-end and I looked in vain to find a mine manager who was not a "Tory," and I told them that on Saturday night I could not find a single mine manager who was not a "Tory." It is a lovely working arrangement, but when this government gets around to raising an adequate and equitable amount of revenue to meet the needs, about which they plead in their "Queen's Park lament," they do not do it.

HON. MR. PORTER: Would you expect the C.C.F. to run a mine?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: They could not do it, they probably could sell horses, but never run a mine.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests was a little hurt because I said something about his relationship with a pulp and paper company, and said he had resigned. I accepted that. But the government does not receive, with its intimate relationship with the pulp and paper and mining industries, enough money to meet the needs of this province for the social services to its people. Yet they go around talking about where to get the revenue, and say they have not raised taxes. That is nonsense, when it is raising, for the people of this province, only \$11 million out of a productive wealth of \$1,100 million—just raising a little bit of money. Increasingly,



the money of this province is to be found, not in the hands of the little people in terms of farms and of homes, but increasingly the money of this province is to be found in corporate wealth, in corporate income, and unless this government is willing to go out and raise that money from the corporate income of this province, they might as well continue their lament for the next thousand years, because from corporate income is the only place they are going to get it. That is the second way, I suggest, we can raise money.

The third way is, that I think it is about time to take a look at the fantastic liquor profits in this province. I see the hon. Minister perk up. He got \$10 million more than he expected this year, and wants to get more next year. The interesting thing in this province is that we have socialized the distribution of hard liquor and I want to make the suggestion to this government, I think it is about time, we socialized the distribution of beer. I think it is about time we socialized the brewers' retail stores, and put them under public ownership, because, as they stand, they are sort of a co-operative, in which the brewers form some sort of a company for the distribution of their product. I have a suggestion to make, and I make this quite sincerely—and would like you to have a look at it; I want to take you out to the province of Saskatchewan again—

HON. MR. PORTER: What about them now?

MR. MacDONALD: Do not get so anxious. Out in the province of Saskatchewan beer has always been handled through the Liquor Commission—on the same basis as hard liquor. Back in 1944—there is an interesting story, in 1944—the Saskatchewan Government about the same time as this government started to promise health insurance, they implemented it immediately after their election. They were faced, of course, with raising the necessary money to underwrite the hospitalization plan across the province, and they looked around to see where they could raise this money.

Since all of the beer sales in the province of Saskatchewan were handled through the Liquor Commission, they decided, at one point, that they were going to pay breweries less and in that way cut into the fantastic profits made by the breweries. They even went a little further, and this will not make the hon. member for Nipissing any happier—they even—

HON. MR. FROST: They charged much more to the consumer?

MR. MacDONALD: They did not. That is a typical evasion, and confusion of the issue. Let me finish.

HON. MR. PORTER: They certainly did.

HON. MR. FROST: They charged more to the consumer.

MR. MacDONALD: They did not and this, Mr. Speaker, is a typical "political red herring," coming from the "political smoothy," if I may use the term. They certainly did not.

HON. MR. FROST: They certainly did.

MR. COLLINGS: Mr. Speaker, I might tell the hon. member that the price of beer to the consumers is considerably higher in the western provinces than it is in Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: You want us to charge more?

MR. MacDONALD: Whether it is or not I do not know, and I do not care. All I am saying is this—

HON. MR. PORTER: Oh, well, the hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

MR. MacDONALD: Are you trying to predict the profits of the brewers, as well as the pulp and paper companies and the mining companies?

Once again, the hon. members are very sensitive. Mr. Speaker, if I might proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: They hear half of what I am going to say, and anticipate the other half of my story which they do not like, so they attempt to confuse the issue. What they did in Saskatchewan was to cut into the brewers' profits.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: And sold it for more.

MR. MacDONALD: They charged the hotel keepers and other agents more, so they increased the amount of revenue coming into the provincial treasury. They did not raise the price to the consumer. If the price of beer is higher in Saskatchewan, than it is in Ontario, it is not because of the action of the government—it has always been higher.

HON. MR. PORTER: The fact is, it is higher.

MR. MacDONALD: Not through the action of the government.

HON. MR. PORTER: The working men here have beer at a price they can afford to pay.

MR. MacDONALD: At least the government in Saskatchewan got out and raised \$2 or \$3 million more which they were able to put into a hospitalization scheme.

HON. MR. PORTER: What about the poor consumer?

MR. MacDONALD: The poor consumer was not paying one cent more afterwards than before.

HON. MR. PORTER: He paid more than he does here under our system.

MR. MacDONALD: Maybe we can settle it this way: he was paying the price set by the Liberal Party, which had just gone out of power.

HON. MR. PORTER: Apparently the change in party did not help the poor consumer a bit.

MR. MacDONALD: That is right. Do you want to reduce the price of beer here?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Now we know why the hon. member came to Ontario from Saskatchewan; it was for cheaper beer.

MR. MacDONALD: We may be having our fun, but I was to suggest to the government that it is about time we cut into the profits of the liquor industry. Here is another area where this government is not so cosy with the brewing interests as they are with the mining and pulp and paper interests. I invite them to take a look at it and see what they can do with it.

HON. MR. PORTER: We are protecting the consumers.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The little man.

HON. MR. FROST: Is that the hon. member's new platform, to raise the price of beer?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with another point which was touched upon by the hon. member for Waterloo North this afternoon, the question of the rising net debt in the province of Ontario. I think the point was very well made by the *Toronto Star* in a cartoon. They took the words of the hon. Prime Minister introducing this latest fairy tale into the political life of Ontario of "the goose that laid the golden egg." They showed the goose having laid a golden egg, but the golden egg happened to be an increase of \$71 million in the net debt of the province after this talk of surpluses and everything else.

I want to draw your attention now to the net debt position.

HON. MR. FROST: I thought the cartoon an excellent one. In fact I cut it out and I am going to take it with me to Ottawa to show that while we are paying to help the rest of Canada we are accumulating an increased debt

in this province, which only verifies what I said, that you can "kill the goose that lays the golden egg." Of course you can.

MR. MacDONALD: One of the saving graces of the hon. Prime Minister is his sense of humour. He can take this cartoon with him, and have his political fun at Ottawa.

HON. MR. PORTER: You were backing us up a while ago about our trip to Ottawa.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, take the cartoon from the *Toronto Star* down, it will probably help.

I want to draw the attention of the hon. members of the House to the fact that when the hon. member for Victoria became hon. Prime Minister in 1948, the net debt of this province was \$468 million. As at the end of March, 1956—

HON. MR. FROST: When was that?

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister heard it the first time, 1948, March 31st. Just about the time the hon. Prime Minister became Prime Minister, roughly within a few months. At the end of March, 1956, the net debt for this province will be \$732 million.

MR. STEWART: What assets has the province for it?

MR. MacDONALD: Do not get so excited. Can I not make my point?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member is only giving half the story. When I took over, the debt was \$500 million and the revenues of the province were \$200 million. It is true that the debt today is \$700 million, but the revenues are over twice as much; in other words, we have used the money to extend the productivity of the province.

MR. MacDONALD: "Political smoothy" at work. If I might continue with what I was saying before I was interrupted. In this intervening period, under the hon. Prime Minister, the net

debt has increased \$264 million. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, what that means? It means that for every single day which the hon. Prime Minister has been in office since 1948, the net debt of this province has increased \$100,000?

HON. MR. FROST: But the revenues have increased that much too.

MR. MacDONALD: Let us face the facts. The net debt has increased \$100,000 every day.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member should look at the entire picture.

MR. MacDONALD: If I might anticipate the excitement on the front benches, I agree that the assets and the revenues have increased, but I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to another fact, that if the net debt of this province has increased \$100,000 a day during the time of very buoyant revenues, should we ever hit a period of economic decline, and this government has to take anything in keeping with a modern government in a modern age, in order to keep going they will have a debt increase which will make the debt of this province to be really fantastic.

I suggest that while it is true we have an income to cope with this debt increase, we still have had a net debt increase of \$100,000 a day for every day in the last 8 years.

HON. MR. PORTER: A few minutes ago the hon. member was criticizing us for putting revenue in the Highway Reserve Fund, which is one of the primary measures to meet the issue for which he is now criticizing us.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member has used the same false argument in connection with Hydro. It is true Hydro's debt today, I suppose, is probably \$1 billion more than it was 6 or 7 years ago, but we have more dams and installations on the rivers, and we do not have the power shortage we had when the hon. members to his right were in power.



MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, if they did not have the Liberals to brow-beat, I do not know how they could have existed politically.

HON. MR. PORTER: We do not know what "mess" the hon. member would make of it, but we have a good idea.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, sometime we will have a chance and the hon. Minister will find out. I want to tie this point in with the theme which I have had already, that this government has been boasting for years that it has not raised taxes. In spite of the fact that revenues have been going up and productive wealth has doubled, the government has refused to raise wealth where the greatest source of it happens to be, that is the corporate wealth of the province.

HON. MR. PORTER: And raising the price of beer for the working man?

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, therefore our debt has increased more than was necessary if they had been willing to increase that tax. Here is a government of business men, which prides itself that it can operate the administration of this province on good business lines, and the fact of the matter is that they have increased the net debt of the province by 50 per cent. They have been "dropping" money like sailors—like slightly inebriated sailors. The present government has refused to raise the money from the place where it is increasingly to be found.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to digress now for a moment to deal with an educational problem. There was a day when we could finance education, when educational costs were lower, and when it was an equitable proposition to raise that lower amount of money on homes and on farm land. However, educational costs have increased and the only way to meet the burden of these costs equitably is to shift the burden more and more to the corporate income raised by the provincial and federal governments, through Federal aid to education

and through grants. This government refuses to do that. What is the result?

Mr. Speaker, about two years ago the Canadian School Trustees Association, following the County Association, hired a specialist in this matter, Dr. M. E. Lazerte, to make a financial study of education across the nation. He first listed the provinces of great wealth. No one was surprised to discover Ontario at the top of the list in terms of wealth, either aggregate or per capita. Then he made a study of the amounts being spent on education in each province. The shocking fact which emerged was that Ontario, which stands at the head of the list in terms of aggregate and per capita wealth, is devoting a smaller proportion of available wealth to education than any other province.

That is true, and the hon. members opposite should not deny it. Why should they shake their heads? Here are two responsible organizations which have hired one of the most reputable figures in the educational field and who came to a conclusion which cannot be denied; and yet the hon. Provincial Treasurer shakes his head. I suppose that the government thinks it can turn black into white. This government is spending a smaller proportion on education than any other province in the Dominion—and the reason is that it has refused to fulfill its election promises of 1943 and 1944. Had the government fulfilled its promises, it would be spending an additional \$25 million or \$30 million on education, and would have doubled the Education Budget in the same 3-year period, during which it has trebled the Highway budget.

Mr. Speaker, had this been done, I would not be receiving letters from School Boards in my riding asking why they cannot have grants for household science and shop works programmes. It is ludicrous to try to carry on a modern educational programme, and at the same time trim off libraries, household science, shop works and so on, as not being part of a modern educational programme.

It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that this government got around to raising

the money where the money is available, instead of indulging in an idle boast about "not raising taxes", when such a statement simply means that the government has not raised the taxes from those quarters where the wealth of the province is available, and instead has been dumping the burden more and more on the home owners and the farmers.

When the government does get around to raising the money, it will certainly lessen the burden where it is now the heaviest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn, in conclusion, to a topic which I have discussed a number of times during this session, and in which at least a dozen hon. members have taken part here. It is the question of Reform Institutions.

In the last three or four weeks, there have been two significant developments in this issue. It is an issue of grave public concern, even if most hon. members of the government like to make-believe that it is not.

One rather significant development is that the general charges—I am not going to say "specific charges" but I say "general charges"—which I have made inside and outside the House have now been substantiated by a highly responsible and authoritative body, namely, the Canadian Association of Social Workers.

I have a letter here which I am going to read into the record. However, before I deal with it, I want to draw the attention of the House to the kind of reaction produced in a number of circles, apart from the government. For example, I was very intrigued this morning to pick up the *Globe and Mail*, that authoritative journal, and to discover that they had an article from Ottawa entitled, "Penal Reform Inquiry Overdue, Croll Claims." I was never able to figure out before how Senator Croll was consigned to the heavenly bliss of the Senate, nor whether he was really outside or inside the Liberal Party, nor where he stands now, but he is a Liberal. The hon. member from Essex North is not here tonight, and the hon. member for South Wellington seemed to be inclined to line

up with the government with regard to my charges on Reform Institutions, and say they were "sort of" "off the beam". I would like to draw their attention to this letter.

HON. MR. FROST: They were not "sort of"; they were "off the beam."

MR. MacDONALD: They were certainly disturbed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if this were not Senator Croll, one would think he was stealing sections from some of the speeches I have made.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: "Dave" Croll would never stoop to that.

MR. MacDONALD: All I can say to the hon. Provincial Secretary is that his relationship with that Liberal, being a good "Tory" a much more intimate relationship than mine, may enable him to speak authoritatively. However, the article states as follows:

His attack—calculated, he admitted, to shock the Canadian people out of their lethargy—hit every phase of the problem with hard words.

Canadian thinking on penology, he charged, suffers from the fact that "the bastille complex has not died."

As far as rehabilitation and probation are concerned, Senator Croll added: "We are not doing the job as it should be done—and as it is being done elsewhere. We may be punishing but we are doing little to cure."

I had been talking about the 19th century justice. I am not going into this question of Senator Croll's speech but I would remind some of the Liberal hon. members they ought to look at this point, to see that their own Party is awakening.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to draw the attention of some people in the Conservative ranks who may think that I am "off the beam." For example, I wish to refer to the hon. member for Cochrane South who sent a letter back home to his constituents, which says:

"One of the bitterest debates which has taken place in the house this session is that dealing with prisons and their inmates. Mr. MacDonald, the C.C.F. leader has, in my opinion, made too much of the issue, and has pilloried Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Reform Institution with little purpose. However, I don't think that his remarks made much impression, and were received with little enthusiasm. His charges in most instances lacked substance, and of course amounted to nothing."

Then we had the hon. member for Waterloo South, who is not in his place this evening. He has gone, in blunt terms, on a number of "conducted tours" to the local training school, and has been shown what they wanted him to see, and came out with a great deal of superficial evidence.

HON. MR. PORTER: How does the hon. member substantiate that statement?

MR. NICKLE: The hon. member is not in the House now.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I need only refer to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development. The hon. members opposite want two rules, one to apply to someone else and one to apply to themselves. The hon. member for Waterloo South gave his account, and quoted one social worker and the hon. Minister interjected that she was one of the finest social workers in the province. I do not know. All I can say is, that she is out of step with everyone else in Canadian social workers organizations, or at least with the majority of them. In fact, I have listened to the hon. member for Waterloo South and I have read in the newspapers that in Ottawa they are considering the question of exchange between here and Moscow. It would be dangerous to send him on one because if they rolled out the red carpet he would swing over so easily that the Conservative party would lose him—and that would be a pity.

There is only one other comment I would like to make before I read this letter, and that is that there are a good many lawyers and doctors in this House, and I would just like to tell these professional people that the Canadian Association of Social Workers is, roughly, in some respects comparable to the Bar Association, and to the Medical Association, in that one of their responsibilities is to watch the high ethics of the profession, and whenever they consider that the high ethics of the profession have been dragged down, to speak up. They have spoken. They wrote a letter to the hon. Prime Minister of this province on February 16th, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

On behalf of more than 400 social workers in the Toronto Branch, I am writing to express our concern about the juvenile training schools of this province, and related operations of the Department of Reform Institutions. We believe there are serious defects in the Department, and respectfully suggest that a thorough-going study of it be made by a competent person or agency.

Recent newspaper accounts of alleged mistreatment of inmates and of political interference have shaken public confidence in the administration of the Department. It is not a sufficient answer that these charges are categorically denied, or countered by visits of newspaper reporters to institutions. Both measures add increasing evidence of underlying confusion of purpose within the Department, from the top administration downwards."

HON. MR. FROST: May I ask what is the date of that letter?

MR. MacDONALD: February 16th. The hon. Prime Minister received the letter, he must know.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, but after I received that letter, Mr. Speaker, and I heard the hon. member for York South make his speech, I judged there was nothing to it.



MR. MacDONALD: As usual, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister is just a little astray from the facts. I made my speech on February 9th, and he received this letter a week later.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister stated that after he received it, he heard my speech. By a strange twist of history, he heard my speech a week earlier. I spoke on February 9th.

HON. MR. FROST: Having heard the speech of the hon. member, there was nothing to it, and I filed the letter.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister did not file the letter; he passed it on to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, who answered it, and is going to meet all these people.

HON. MR. FROST: That is alright.

MR. MacDONALD: How much further can the hon. Prime Minister get from the facts?

"In our opinion, this confusion itself needs careful examination by a competent and independent authority.

The government of Ontario deserves much credit for parts of its Reform Institutions programme. In the creation of the Department of Reform Institutions in 1946 there was a declaration of intention to pursue reform purposes rather than punitive purposes. Since that time certain measures have implemented that intention, notably the district industrial farms, the Brampton Reformatory, the Alex Brown Clinic for Alcoholics, the new Mercer unit for women, and the new Clinic for Drug Addicts at Mimico. These are substantial advances.

Elsewhere in the Department the evidence is more disturbing, for example:

1. In the Training Schools at Cobourg, Bowmanville and Galt. Admittedly, many of these children

the difficult behaviour problems. This fact in itself would indicate the need for a concentration of modern therapeutic facilities for their treatment—psychiatric, psychological, and social; this is standard and approved practice for such children. Yet these schools are marked by a lack of such facilities. Why?"

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Because the hon. member for York South is not there.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, this government is going to awaken to the fact that this is a serious matter which cannot be treated by lighthearted buffoonery. If I may continue.

"Moreover, they pass on their most difficult children to the adult prisons, to Guelph and to the Mercer. Why do they fail with these children, and what effective treatment do these very needy children receive in the prisons?"

2. The Ontario Reformatories do not reform. While the record at Brampton is good, with carefully selected inmates, others are not good. Guelph receives young offenders under age 25—the most reformable age group. Yet three-quarters of the youths at Guelph are repeaters; they have been there before—one-third of them have been there more than three times. This is failure, not reform. Why?

3. There is no effective rehabilitation system for paroled or discharged inmates."

These are people who are in this field, working in it every day.

"Criminologists are agreed that the period following discharge is the most difficult one in the ex-prisoner's experience; it is then that he needs the most help for rehabilitation. In Ontario, he gets little help, and that of poor quality. These are the findings of your recent Select Committee on Reform Institutions (Chapter VII). After 10 years of operation, why is there no effective after-care programme in Reform Institutions?"

From the events of the past year it is clear that there is a strong conflict within the Department between punitive and reformatory philosophies and practices. This conflict has hampered the work of the Department and helps to explain some of the bizarre and tragic situations which have occurred. Clearly such a conflict cannot be allowed to continue.

It should be stated that this conflict is not confined to the Department, it is raging in the total handling of the offender by our society, and appears in all parts of it—the Criminal Code, police, courts, and institutions. In this sense the Department is partly a victim of it. But to be unaware of it is surely an outstanding evidence of political and administrative ineptness.”

A responsible and authoritative body.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say I disagree with that entirely.

MR. MacDONALD: Very good. I am glad. The Association will hear that. Let me continue, Mr. Speaker:

“A final point needs attention. Offenders are human beings who have made mistakes. Whatever the philosophy of the Department, it can only hold them out of the community for two years, under the law; the average term is about six months. Then they return to the community. The Department, as part of the criminal law, is charged with the protection of the community. If they return worse than they went in, the Department is failing in its primary obligation to the people of Ontario, and the taxpayer is paying out millions of dollars only to be put in greater jeopardy. This is a tragic human result and a gross miscarriage of public responsibility.”

Strong words, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, that is just what he thinks, and probably it agrees with the thinking of the hon. member for York South.

MR. MacDONALD: This is not “he”. This is the equivalent of the Canadian Medical Association speaking about practices in the medical profession, or the Bar Association speaking about practices in the legal profession. Do not derogate this and pour scorn on them.

HON. MR. FROST: I say it is pure nonsense.

MR. MacDONALD: Very good, we shall see.

HON. MR. FROST: And also about 75 per cent. of what the hon. member says is nonsense.

MR. MacDONALD: I am quoting this at the moment. The hon. Prime Minister is speaking about this, I think.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for York South talks nonsense 75 per cent. of the time.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Prime Minister had better smile, because he is going to lose his humour. The concluding paragraph, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

Our point is clear. Ontario has had enough of punitive militarism—and those are not my words, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. FROST: Of course they are.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes, they were my words, exactly—the hon. Prime Minister is right—but this is the Canadian Association of Social Workers.

MR. R. M. MYERS (Waterloo South): What do they know about it?

MR. MacDONALD: They know a great deal about it, they happen to be in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: This concludes:

"Ontario has had enough of punitive militarism applied against offenders, it has clearly failed. It is high time to provide intelligent, humane, and responsible services for the offender. The first step is to see what services are needed, and then to provide them. Hence a competent, independent judgment is needed immediately. Such sound judgments can be had by or through the Canadian Welfare Council, the American Correctional Association, or the Osborne Association of New York. We commend them to you.

Yours respectfully,

(signed) BETTY C. GRAHAM,

*President.*

Toronto Branch, Canadian Association  
Of Social Workers."

That letter, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself; I do not need to add anything to it, but I do not want to suggest to the government that it cannot be ignored, it cannot say it is "nonsense."

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for York South care to quote the Reverend gentleman who gave quite a discourse on labour matters a few days ago, as an authority on that subject, since he is dragging in people of every walk of life except those who know anything about it.

MR. MacDONALD: The Reverend gentleman is no authority in the field of labour. This is a group of people who happen to be active in this field, and have taken a continued interest in it.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I would say it is just about on a par.

MR. MacDONALD: Alright, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to defend the Canadian Association of Social Workers. They can defend themselves and their voice can and will be harkened to, even if this government treats it in the way it prefers to do at this time.

The second significant development occurred last month, and that is, the government's tactics in regard to this issue. They have laughed at it, they have sloughed the matter off. They have said black is white. As I stated in my comment, after the van Nostrand letter, they are attempting to do precisely what they did in the highways scandal, cover up rather than clean up the situation. I want to repeat, it may take a little time, but this government will not get away with it, because there are too many people in the province of Ontario who are genuinely disturbed.

HON. MR. NICKLE: We are just giving good government, that is all. We are rolling along, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: As a matter of fact, the thing that rather typifies this government's attitude was the van Nostrand letter episode, and if the government wants to make another spectacle of itself in the fashion it did in the case of that letter, let them go ahead, because what they did in the case of that letter is what they have done in the entire issue, they have tried to laugh it out of the House, until the 3 or 4 front benchers who sat and laughed got the cue, and eventually they found the thing was so serious that the jeers and laughter choked in their throats, and they faced up to the issue.

Now, if I may get back to the Department of Planning and Development—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, may I say a word? During my time as Minister of Reform Institutions, we had a little trouble at Burwash, and I appointed a social worker, a Professor, to go up there and investigate and make a report, and the report which he presented to the Deputy was such that I asked the Deputy, "Do you think the gentleman wants that report to go before the House?" and he said, "I will go back and ask him." In that report, he had recommended that Burwash was no fit place for a prisoner to live, but he suggested that your fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, might be taken up there and placed in Burwash as mentally



ill, but it was no fit place for men who had broken the law, who had been in Kingston Penitentiary 4 or 5 times, and perhaps in Sing Sing, and the recommendation by this great social worker was that we send our brothers, fathers, sisters and mothers to Burwash, a place which was not fit for the prisoners. That was my first experience, and I hope it will be my last, with a man of that calibre. The next recommendation was they should have a beverage room up there. Did you ever hear of anything so silly? I said I did not want that part of the report to go to the government, and I suggested my Deputy go back and ask this gentleman if he wanted that report to go to the government, and apparently not, because it was deleted. First, he wanted to put our mentally ill in Burwash, and then open a beverage room at the institution. That was the report we received from one of those—I do not know just what to call him.

MR. MacDONALD: Are you finished?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Perhaps one of the hon. members who is a medical man can give a definition of what I really should say.

MR. MacDONALD: I would like to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the man about whom the hon. Minister is talking, is one of the greatest professors of penology and criminology in this country. He is on the staff of the social workers at the University of Toronto, and I suggest there is not a single person in the Department of Reform Institutions who could hold a candle to him as a penologist. I never read this report, and you may “pooh pooh” it all you want to, but this man is one of great stature in penology in this country.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I am very glad to know that is the man from whom you are getting your information—I am very glad to know that. I laid the trap, and the hon. member walked right into it.

MR. MacDONALD: I will tell you where the embarrassment would be—

HON. MR. DUNBAR: You walked right into the trap.

MR. MacDONALD: Do not gloat too much, George.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No, I was not through the battle of Ottawa.

MR. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members are aware there is a proper method of addressing the hon. members of this House, and I am sorry the hon. member for York South prefers to get into personal arguments with the hon. Provincial Secretary. I think the rules of the House should be carried out, and the hon. members not address each other directly across the floor.

MR. MacDONALD: I am sorry I offended the sense of dignity of the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: All remarks in the House must be made through the chair, and members referred to as “the hon. member for such-and-such a riding” or “the hon. Minister of such a department.”

MR. MacDONALD: It was a very illuminating little episode.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member is one of the “hugger-muggers” now.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not admit that, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member will learn a great deal as he goes along. It will take a little time, but he will learn.

MR. MacDONALD: While we were discussing the van Nostrand letter, the point I am interested in was the attitude of the government toward the letter and one of the significant features is that after discussing Reform Institutions, and during the course of my reading that letter, I had come to what was the

most abusive part of the letter, namely the statement that I had enlisted just ahead of the draft, a statement which Dr. van Nostrand, in his wisdom, has since retracted. In the course of reading the letter, one of the hon. Ministers interjected "Just beat the gun, eh?" In other words, he repeated the abuse, and the dirty insinuation.

Mr. Speaker, three weeks have gone by, and this hon. Minister who rose in his place in the House last Wednesday and spoke about people who "get into the gutter," should know what he is talking about, because he is closer to the gutter himself than any of the hon. members of this House.

HON. MR. NICKLE: Well, well—

MR. MacDONALD: Just stay quiet. For three weeks this has gone on, and I can say emphatically that I would not crawl across on my hands and knees seeking an apology. It is obvious the kind of petty politics he played, but as long as that statement for which no apology has been made, stands on the record, it reflects on him, much more than anybody else. I leave the matter right there.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That is good.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out—and I say this to the hon. Minister more in sorrow than in anger—that at the outset, three or four days after this battle started on Reform Institutions, the hon. Minister gave a Press conference in which he accused me of "mud slinging," and made the comment that I had not bothered going around to his office and talking to him about it. I want to say to him, and to this House, that, as far as he is concerned, he had a point. The only excuse I can offer is that I was under the impression he was not back in his office, but within 24 hours of reading his Press conference, I contacted his office, and within 48 hours, we had a lengthy discussion.

I was under the impression at the end of the discussion that the hon. Minister had perhaps a somewhat differ-

ent view of what my motives were in raising this question. I shall not quote exactly what happened, but I came away from there with the idea—perhaps mistakenly—that the hon. Minister thought my motives in this whole proposal were not those of "mud slinging". Of course, he concluded his comments by saying, "Of course, I will have to defend my Department." That is the right of any hon. Minister, to defend his Department. But what I complain about is that his conduct since then, has been part of the whole government's attitude and approach to this issue. He went on the air and spent a third of his time once again in personal abuses about myself, which were absolutely extraneous—

HON. MR. FOOTE: I did not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister did. I have a copy of your broadcast, which was published with the funds of the Conservative Party.

HON. MR. FOOTE: What I said was factual, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. Minister came into the House and abused me, and I may say that the hon. Minister, in fact the entire Cabinet, can come into this House and abuse me anytime, because I can assure them that "sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me."

HON. MR. FOOTE: I told the hon. member the truth, and he did not like it.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member started it.

MR. MacDONALD: I did not start the personal abuses at all. As a matter of fact, this whole issue of last Wednesday, when one of his Cabinet colleagues did not respect the sensibilities of the hon. Minister, by referring to the war record of the hon. Minister and to mine, which was completely extraneous and on that occasion we had the hon. Minister's war record dragged in again, as part of the discussion.

HON. MR. FOOTE: The hon. member knows I did not ask for it.

MR. MacDONALD: I am saying the hon. Minister did not, I cannot understand how a Cabinet colleague would not at least respect the hon. Minister's sensibilities on the issue, but that Cabinet colleague has his own conception of patriotism. Everytime he rises, he waves a flag, and he thinks his conception of patriotism is the only one. I agree he should have recognized the hon. Minister's sensibilities.

What I want to do is point out two or three illustrations of how this government is handling this issue of Reform Institutions, and the public discussions in regard to them.

For example, the hon. Minister rose in the House and gave once again the story of the Smith case. I am not going into the details of the Smith case with the exception of saying one thing. The hon. Minister stated these instances are not premeditated and are not evidences of brutality.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man who goes back at night, lines up seven boys, partly strips them, takes the strap and straps seven boys, and we are asked to believe that it is not premeditated.

HON. MR. FOOTE: One of the social workers said he was one of the best men in the place.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know what the hon. Minister is talking about. All I know that in advance of the premeditated proposition, he had been warned, on at least one occasion, by the Superintendent because he had slapped a boy so badly his mouth was bleeding, but nobody had actually seen it, so the evidence of the slapping and brutality was in advance of this, and this is the kind of thing the hon. Minister says is not premeditated and wants to dismiss it in a light-hearted manner.

There is another case of the boy who was struck, and his jaw or his arm was broken, I forget which. The hon. Minister explains the incident and I ask the

hon. members of the House to listen to this rather carefully, he said:

Two boys were engaged in a fight and the junior supervisor was unable to stop them. This man stepped in to assist him and slapped one of the boys. The report says that "there was a doubt that the fracture was due to his action," and there seems to be strong possibility that it may have been due to a severe blow struck by the other boy. After all, it was the two boys who were fighting, not the supervisor and the boys.

This man, in any case, was dismissed. The interesting point is that in the hon. Minister's explanation of that incident to the House, was one which was given by the man involved. His own Deputy Minister refused to accept the explanation at the time, and dismissed the man, rather than give him an opportunity to resign. Two years later, the hon. Minister comes in and—perhaps unwittingly, I do not know—quotes to the House the explanation his own Deputy Minister refused to accept because he knew it was not true.

HON. MR. FOOTE: I was not the one who dismissed him.

MR. MacDONALD: The Deputy Minister refused to accept the explanation the hon. Minister gave to the House.

HON. MR. FOOTE: That is the report from the Director of Training Schools.

MR. MacDONALD: If I might get back to the incident of the Smith case which the hon. Minister stated was not political interference, I wonder if he is aware of the fact a good many people have been re-appointed to the staff after dismissals. In March, 1954, a directive went out from his department that in the future, any person dismissed would not be re-appointed and yet two months later, the hon. Minister himself violated his own directive by asking the Deputy Minister to take that man back on the staff.



HON. MR. FOOTE: That directive did not go out.

MR. MacDONALD: It went out. The hon. Minister should check on that.

HON. MR. FOOTE: I know. Except in exceptional circumstances.

MR. MacDONALD: I know of the circumstances under which it went out, and that is one of them.

Mr. Speaker, the other incident I want to mention is that when I spoke 3 weeks ago, I cited 2 rather shocking instances to support my charge that there was some validity in the statement that there was political interference in appointments.

I cited the instance of a man who had homosexual tendencies who was appointed to the staff over the recommendation of the superintendent of that institution. After investigation, the department was agreed this was the situation, and yet he was retained until the end of the year. The hon. Minister mumbled something at that time. He spoke afterwards, but did not mention this case, although he had the opportunity of doing so. Three weeks have gone by, and this is blandly ignored.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister will have a chance to speak later. In fact, there are a great many things about which I wish he would speak.

HON. MR. FROST: Having listened to hours of this from the hon. member, may I say the only thing in which he is really expert, is spreading innuendoes and insinuations, and smearing peoples' characters, without any evidence whatsoever. The hon. member has never visited one of the Reform Institutions in Ontario. He has been an hon. member of this House since last June, and is entitled to visit them, and to see for himself what is going on, but he has never gone into one of them.

He has indulged in listening to a great deal of hearsay, and using this hearsay in such a way as to injure peoples' reputations.

The hon. member, a few moments ago, referred to some remarks made about himself. I would say he invites that sort of thing. It has been a long time since we have had an hon. member in this House who has stooped so low as to pick up insinuations of that type, to throw at other people, and make remarks which are derogatory to the character and standing of others.

MR. MacDONALD: I wish the hon. Prime Minister would be sure of his facts before he makes a pronouncement. He said I had not visited any of the institutions.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member has not been in any institution.

MR. MacDONALD: I have been in one. Call up the superintendent at the Mercer.

HON. MR. FROST: When was the hon. member there?

MR. MacDONALD: I was there.

HON. MR. FROST: How long ago?

MR. MacDONALD: About a month ago.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member said in this House he had not been in one of them.

MR. MacDONALD: I say once again the hon. Prime Minister is inaccurate. As a matter of fact, I gave that speech, one week after I had been at Mercer.

It is all very well to dismiss my comments as "innuendoes," but here is an authoritative organization which has in general terms, supported my charges, and this government is not going to be able to dismiss them by saying it is only innuendo.

I have given facts, and I have the documentation of the facts.

HON. MR. FROST: I have not heard a fact from the hon. member yet.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, the hon. Prime Minister has.

All I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that this government is not going to be able to ignore these facts, is not going to be able to ignore the situation, is not going to continue to "brush it off" in the way the hon. Prime Minister has once again this evening. I want to say this very quietly and not excitedly to the hon. Prime Minister—

HON. MR. FROST: If the hon. member would produce some facts; this is just nonsense.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, there is not one rule for us and another for the Prime Minister, I have not conceded the floor to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The same rule applies to all hon. members in the House.

MR. MacDONALD: I have said it before, and I will say it again, that he interrupts when he feels like it, and reverses the Orders of the Day when he wants to. I have not seen such a display by any Prime Minister, outside of Premier Duplessis of the Province of Quebec.

HON. MR. FROST: I am getting into big company now.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, you are, but it is not the kind of company you are usually proud to be with. If I may put it in the way the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions put it, when he told the story about the boy who got a blister on his posterior and then had to sit on it, may I say to this government that if it ignores these issues and does nothing about it, the government will find out on whose bottom this blister is in this affair. They say they do not know. They will not face the facts of the issue.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: What would you have us do, resign?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacDONALD: I would say this to the hon. Prime Minister in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I have no desire to make this a political issue.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Well, what in the world are you doing?

MR. MacDONALD: When the guffaw from the hon. Minister of Health has died down I will repeat it; I have no desire to make this a political issue. One of the things I look forward to is the day when we will have more action on political issues, and I want to pay tribute to the hon. Minister to the kind of treatment they are giving to the needs of the people, I have had many cases and I look forward to the day—

MR. WARDROPE: You are inviting them.

MR. MacDONALD: That is true. If there was one man who is not getting justice in a reform institution, I will be glad to help him get it. I look forward to the day when we can co-operate to the full, but we shall not, until something is done to change the basic policies in the reform institutions.

If I might introduce another little fairy tale since we have had our "goose laying golden eggs" and "milch cows", and all the rest of it, I would remind the hon. Prime Minister of the fairy tale of the king who was told there was quite a bit of unrest among his subjects, and he did not know whether he should believe it. He dressed himself as a beggar and went out among them and talked to them and heard the truth. I would suggest the hon. Prime Minister go out and talk to a few people some of whom are members of his own party and who are experts in this field. After he has talked to these people let him decide whether or not I am talking completely "off the beam"; let him decide whether or not his government is going to laugh off or slough off this affair. I suggest if the hon. Prime Minister put his public interest before

his party interest, and wants to put the money where it will do the most good, he will do something about this, and I invite him to do it.

MR. COWLING: He has already done it, that is why he is now the hon. Prime Minister.

MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Edwards in the chair.

#### ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

HON. A. K. ROBERTS (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to vary the usual procedure slightly, in this way, that as each main item is called I would like to make comments in relation to that item, rather than give my whole statement on the estimates before the estimates are called. I think it might have a little closer association with the particular subject matter, and will be perhaps a little less tedious to the House if it is done in that way, rather than one continuous statement. I hope that the estimates of my department will in due course this evening be approved by the House.

I would say the total amounts to approximately \$15½ million which is an increase over last year. Despite the fact that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has shown a very commendable attitude as guardian of the funds of the province, he has seen fit to give approval to these figures, and I hope the House will do likewise. I might say that I am happy that I do not have to follow some of the theories of the hon. member for York South to obtain these funds.

May I say at this point that, despite the comments which the hon. member

for York South made in his speech, in his mad desire to find something wrong with the government, moving from one field to another with the agility of a tight rope walker, and despite the use of all the "jimmies" in his kit, he has not succeeded in prying open so much as one window in the fortress.

During the time since the hon. Prime Minister has been in office, from 1949 to 1956, we have had 7 years of prosperity and if the hon. Prime Minister remains in that capacity for another 7 years we will, no doubt, continue having years of plenty or, at least, we will have much more likelihood of having another 7 years of plenty, than if anyone on this side of the House were to yield to the doctrines which have been advanced by the hon. member for York South.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, what has this to do with the estimates? What number on the estimates is it?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It is an introduction to the estimates, it is to help get the House in tune, a little, after the mis-cuing of the last hour. The people of the province have had, and are having, the greatest prosperity since Confederation. I am not going to take up anything like the time taken by the hon. member for York South. I would like to be fair and say that a man in as desperate a position as is the hon. member for York South, in his position as leader of a party of 3—3 wise men in a boat, trying hard to keep afloat—under those circumstances perhaps has to try to "put on a show," and say things he himself expects nobody would believe.

MR. MacDONALD: Who wrote that essay for you?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Now with respect to item 201, which is the Main Office of the Attorney-General's Department. It comprises 10 lawyers, including the Deputy Attorney-General, and 29 non-professional staff, secretaries, clerks and stenographers. Its function is to act as legal adviser to the government and governmental departments, and to



supervise the administration of justice in the province.

In regard to legal work in connection with various matters, the legal staff directs crown attorneys with respect to prosecution of offences and gives legal opinions to them and to magistrates, coroners and others, when requested. They conduct all criminal appeals brought to the accused against their conviction or sentence for indictable offences before the Court of Appeal, and appeals brought by the Crown against acquittals or against inadequate sentences. The criminal appeals number about 300 a year. In addition, counsel from the department appear on motions to quash convictions, stated cases and applications by way of mandamus, prohibition or certiorari.

I have already mentioned, in an earlier sitting of the House, the work of the branch that has to do with the Unsatisfied Judgments Fund, which is conducted through the Main Office, and I will repeat the figures. In 1955 the staff carried out 802 investigations, intervened in 591 cases, appeared on 604 applications for payment out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and settled 434 cases.

In addition to the above, there is, of course, the work involved in the administrative supervision of all the branches of all the Department, the appointment of staff, the appointment of Division Court clerks and bailiffs, justices of the peace, coroners, magistrates, crown attorneys, juvenile court judges, local registrars of deeds, provincial police and the staffs for the various court offices throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman if I may stop at that point with respect to Item 201, I will do so.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, with reference to Item No. 13, under vote 201, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General how are those items provided for? I do not recall seeing anything similar to that in last year's Estimates.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It is a grant.

MR. MACAULAY: But what are the mechanics of that kind of grant?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It is placed in the Estimates as a vote of the House, and then measured out as required. The hon. member will remember that Judge McKendrick was killed on the Bench. Someone shot him.

MR. MACAULAY: Yes, it was not the impropriety of it, it was only that I was interested in the mechanics of the arrangement.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It has to do with the person I mentioned, and also the widow of Constable M. F. Maitland, but chiefly the widows who receive certain monthly allowances. The balance is used to pay a monthly allowance to former employees of this department, who are not eligible to contribute to the Civil Service Superannuation Fund. The balance is based on one-half the allowance they would have received had they been qualified to contribute.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates last year there was an item for the Ontario Fuel Board of \$184,000. I do not see it there this year.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, this item was transferred to the Treasury Department, and we passed it last Friday.

Vote No. 201 agreed to.

On vote No. 202:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: On vote No. 202; this particular item covers the Legislative Council. The regular staff consists of 3 lawyers, a legislative editor and 3 stenographers. All are highly skilled in the exacting techniques required in the preparation of legislation. During sessions the staff is increased by the engagement of a proof reader. The office as now organized is geared to operate efficiently at all times, but particularly during the peak-load periods before and during sessions of the Legislature.

Vote No. 202 agreed to.

On vote No. 203:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The Registrar of Regulations has certain statutory duties, defined in The Regulations Act. He also assists the various departments in drafting and preparing proposed regulations with a view to ensuring they comply with the Act. The staff of the office is composed of a personnel of 4.

Vote No. 203 agreed to.

On vote No. 204:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, vote No. 204 is divided into 2 sections, the Supreme Court Master's office and the Supreme Court Registrar's office.

The Master's offices, Judicial Branch of the Supreme Court offices at Osgoode Hall. Its staff consists of the Senior Master, 3 Masters, 3 Assistant Masters, in addition to stenographic reporter, bankruptcy clerk and two court stenographers.

MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, what are the names of these 7 officials and what are their salaries?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Marriott, Senior Master, salary \$10,650; F. G. Cushing, Master, \$9,150; F. G. Cook, Master and Registrar in Bankruptcy, \$9,150; C. W. Smyth, Registrar of the Supreme Court, \$9,500; J. S. Beattie, Assistant Master and Taxing Officer, \$8,000.

MR. MACAULAY: Yes, but that is not all of them. There are several others. What about them?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Bristow, \$6,700; Mr. Anglin, \$5,550; Mr. Hunter, \$5,850.

MR. MACAULAY: With reference to Mr. Bristow, whom I mentioned to the hon. Attorney-General earlier, I believe. This man does a tremendous job, and is in charge of one of the most important courts in our province, namely the Mechanics' Lien Court, through which a tremendous amount of litigation

is processed. While I do not think he holds any more important position than the Taxing Officer, I believe the salary is inadequate for the position he holds. Has the government given any consideration to increasing it?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: As far as Mr. Bristow is concerned, in common with other officers who come under this department, he has received consideration, and next month I think is the starting date of a new period. Perhaps we should not deal with individual cases at this point, but I might say—and this is perhaps of interest to the House—that if these Estimates are passed they will involve salary increases to staff of this department in the amount of \$807,400, which would appear to indicate that, despite some of the criticism which may have been levelled, there is definite attention being paid to this matter. Whether it is sufficient or not may be a matter of opinion, but definite attention is being paid to the salaries of some 3,500 employes of this department.

With respect to the other portion of vote 204, that is the Registrar's Office, headed by Mr. Smyth; at the present time, the staff of the Registrar consists of 34 persons. Of that number, 18 are permanent staff. The duties of the office are very considerable, and include the Registrar's Office, Central Office, the Office of the Deputy Registrar, Trial Court Offices at the City Hall, Weekly Court Office, and Office of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, as well as the Entry Office and the Surrogate Court Office.

MR. R. M. WHICHER (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would like to say anything about allowances to judges, the last statutory item?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I believe the hon. member has reference to the statutory allowance of \$1,000 to each Supreme Court Judge. There are some 29 of them in all, and each receives a statutory allowance of \$1,000. In addition, there is \$1,500 basic for a Surrogate Court Judge. So as not to confuse,

may I point out that Surrogate Court Judges are County Court Judges, and that the item of \$1,000 refers to Supreme Court Judges.

Vote 204 agreed to.

On vote 205:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: With respect to vote 205, there are 18 full-time reporters, who cover all the Supreme Court sittings of the High Court throughout the province.

Vote 205 agreed to.

On vote 206:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: With respect to vote 206, the Master of Titles exercises jurisdiction in relation to land titles throughout the province, in the way of advice, approval and development and maintenance of a unified procedure. By a recent amendment, which is now before the House, there will be the equivalent of an Inspector of Land Titles vested in the Senior Master of Titles.

In the administration of Land Titles, involving as it does a specialized knowledge of the law of Real Property and allied subjects, the Local Masters of Titles are constantly referring to the Master of Titles, at Toronto, innumerable matters upon which they require legal assistance, advice and rulings.

Vote 206 agreed to.

On vote 207:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: On vote 207, the Criminal Justice Accounts: the Audit Branch of Criminal Justice Accounts reports that the office audits 37 organized counties' quarterly accounts, the number of accounts vary in respect to the size of the county and the amount of crime. Its work includes Metropolitan Toronto and City of Toronto quarterly accounts. There is considerable detail work, for instance, searching for the actual date of committal for trial, or date of conviction of all indictable prisoners. The magistrates' and probation officers' monthly travelling expenses are rendered here and audited.

There are 11 unorganized districts; each treasurer has an accountable advance. The treasurer renders a monthly financial statement, with receipts, and these are checked here. The maintenance accounts from the 11 districts are rendered monthly, and general accounts quarterly. This branch also audits all provincial election accounts. The staff consists of 6.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, if we are on vote 207, which includes the last item on page 22, may I speak to that?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Is that on "probation"?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I will have something to say about that later.

MR. MacDONALD: Fine.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: With respect to police and probation services, the services presently organized consist of the director, a training officer and 83 probation officers in the field. The secretarial staff consists of 47 women secretaries. These officers are resident in the county or district in which they serve, and are available to all courts in their respective jurisdictions.

Their work is 3-fold, consisting of pre-sentence reports, supervision of probationers, and family counselling.

When the 4 pending appointments in Algoma, Rainy River, Huron and Lennox and Addington have been made, only 5 areas of the province will be without probation staff, those being Bruce, Victoria and Haliburton, Leeds and Grenville, Lanark and Prescott and Russell. The Budget for 1956-57 is \$550,000, which I think is an increase of about \$80,000 or so over the previous year.

Perhaps while on that subject I might give to the House certain statistics which have been furnished to me entitled, "Work load for 1955."



Total number under probation supervision in 1955, 9,919.

Total number placed on probation during 1955, 5,380.

The breakdown of the above figures is as follows:

Total number of adults under probation supervision in 1955, 6,094.

Total number of adults placed on probation during 1955, 3,158.

Total number of children under probation supervision in 1955, 3,825.

Total number of children placed on probation during 1955, 2,222.

Total number of husband and wife cases counselled by probation officers which did not subsequently have to go to trial, 72,688.

Total number of "reporting" visits made by probationers to probation officers for supervision, 47,087.

Total number of visits by probation officers to probationers' homes for supervision, 38,267.

Total number of pre-sentence reports and social histories prepared by probation officers, 5,650.

612 of these reports were forwarded in triplicate to The Department of Reform Institutions where a person was committed to prison rather than being placed on probation.

In the same fashion, 37 such reports were forwarded to Kingston and Stony Mountain Penitentiaries.

Total number of persons supervised on ticket-of-leave for The Department of Justice in Ottawa, 45.

Under the heading of "monies":

Total amount of restitution collected from probationers following criminal actions—\$43,586.35.

Total amount of support money collected for deserted wives and children—\$2,375,943.72. This figure is subject to audit on the part of each individual on what value they would place on it, but the figure I have before me is this:

Total amount of earnings of the 6,094 adult probationers—and this figure is conjectural, but the director

supplied it—which was poured back into the national economy, \$10 million.

That is the report on the probation services.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, this is one field of the penal programme of this government to which I would like to give unqualified support and credit. I have a question at the end of my remarks which I would like to ask, but just let me elaborate a bit.

This belated development of probation in Canada—and although it is belated in Canada, the reason Ontario can be given credit is that it is certainly taking the lead—really raises one of the most astounding features of this whole problem of an effect in penal programme. I wonder, for example, if hon. members are aware that in the Province of Ontario, which has a population of 5 million, last year we had more people convicted and sentenced, for whatever length of term it may be, than they did in the whole of Great Britain with over 40 million people? There were 38,000 to 40,000 people convicted in the Province of Ontario, and there were about 33,000 convicted in Great Britain, with 8 times the population.

That in itself is a problem which quite frankly puzzles me as to why there are that many. However, I think one of the answers to the more effective penal programme elsewhere is that they have developed a probation system which means, in a great percentage of cases, people who are convicted but are not sent to any institution at all. They are permitted to stay at their homes, under the supervision of the probation officer, so the state is not put to the expense of keeping them in an institution, the municipality is not put to the expense of keeping their families, and there is not the disrupting influence of a broken family, with the father away and the family marked in the eyes of the community, particularly in the case of children where the father happens to be away in some institution and other children learn about it.

It is obviously a humane and effective thing, and the conclusive part of it, Mr. Chairman, is this—and I think my figures are correct: 3 out of every 4 people put on probation do not become repeaters, in other words, they are cured, they see the error of their ways. Yet before we had probation and such people all went into institutions, the record shows that 3 out of every 4 became repeaters. Clearly, therefore, our institutions, as I have attempted to show on another occasion, are not doing a job. We could stop this extra cost, and everything by simply putting people on probation.

The other point with regard to the cost angle of the problem and which, to me, seems to be very emphatic in support of this kind of programme, is that, from the figures that the hon. Attorney-General gave us, each of these probationary officers has well in excess of 100 people under his supervision. Now, if one of those people goes into one of our institutions, the cost is between \$1,500 and \$2,000 a year to keep him there.

In other words, if a probation officer keeps 4 or 5 people out of institutions, and particularly if he assists them in not becoming repeaters, he more than pays his salary. Each probationary officer is, in effect, paying his salary 4 or 5 times over. Therefore, this programme, because it is effective, because it saves money, and because it costs little, should be expanded as rapidly as we can find the personnel. We must remember that each person on probation costs about \$50, because each probationary officer is looking after something in excess of 100 persons.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question I wish to ask of the Attorney-General. I recognize that finding suitable probationary officers is not the easiest thing in the world, but I often wondered whether the sole restriction regarding the expansion is the finding of suitable people. Can the hon. Attorney-General give this House an assurance that if people can be found, the money will be available to take them on the staff?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer there is in connection with the finding of the money. As has been mentioned earlier, the actual increase in these Estimates for the coming year, over the amount last year—which I said I thought was about \$80,000—would be, more correctly, about \$105,000. That is practically a 20 per cent. increase. Each year, there has been quite a substantial increase. We cannot do everything at once, but the fact that we are requesting—and, I hope, getting—considerably more this year, would indicate that we are moving towards our goal.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has confirmed my point. It seems to me that money should not be a consideration, because every officer pays his salary 4 or 5 times over. It seems sensible to me that, since each probationary officer saves money 4 or 5 times over, money should not be a deterrent to the expanding of the staff as quickly as suitable people can be found. I understand that we have 85 probationary officers, but I understand also that to do the kind of job in Ontario that is being done in Britain, we should have 200, in other words, a 150 per cent. increase.

If you are saving money by employing them, it does not seem to me to be a strong ground of argument that we have increased the government allocation for this purpose. If it were increased still further, the government would save money, as the additional probationary officers would be covering their cost 4 or 5 times over.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General a further question? In the actual procedure in a court, when a citizen is charged with an offence, does the probationary officer look into this matter before the case proceeds to trial, and does he advise the magistrate as to whether the person should be placed on probation, or is that left entirely to the discretion of the magistrate?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that is only in the case of a request by a magistrate for a pre-sentence report. It occurs only in a certain type of case, and it is not a general rule.

MR. NIXON: Would the hon. Attorney-General not think it worthy of consideration, as to whether the probationary officer might advise the magistrate in every case, where he considers it advisable?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Any suggestion from the hon. member for Brant is always welcome, and we will give it consideration.

MR. NIXON: It has been suggested to me that certain magistrates do not appreciate any suggestions from the probationary officers.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, is not the answer to that question, that the probationary officers are so overloaded with work at present, that to put upon them another load of cases would be impossible?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: In the field in which they are working now, they have plenty to do. I think that is quite true. It may be that the suggestion as to expansion would be something well worthwhile, and we will look into it.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, in regard to the item in vote 207, item No. 5, why is that included in the hon. Attorney-General's Estimates? Secondly, how many magistrates have we, under item No. 6?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The number of magistrates in the whole province is about 87. There is a difference between counties and districts. The government pays considerably more towards the upkeep in a district than in a county. The details are found in the administration of justice expenses.

MR. MACAULAY: I was wondering why it did not come under The Department of Reform Institutions.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: In the northern part of the province, there are 11 districts, and those districts are on a different basis from the counties.

MR. MACAULAY: That heading under "county" would be under the Reform Institutions' Estimates?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It includes clothing and that sort of thing for prisoners. There is a different method of calculation to be found in the districts.

MR. MACAULAY: I did not understand why it should not be under The Department of Reform Institutions.

MR. J. WINTERMEYER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General for an explanation in regard to the substantial increase in "maintenance". I believe it was \$15,000 last year, and I see it is \$50,000 this year.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: In regard to "Crime Detection Laboratory"; this item is to pay for the laboratory and office equipment, and supplies. The laboratory is being moved into larger and better quarters, and additional equipment is being purchased.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the hon. Attorney-General's reaction to the resolution passed by the Ontario members of the Council of the Canadian Bar Association, meeting at the Royal York Hotel in February. This is the substance of their recommendation:

That a Royal Commission be appointed to enquire into the administration of justice in Ontario. The council, with George McGillivray, QC, as chairman, cited the fact that provincial courts as presently constituted were organized for the requirements of many years ago. Council members contended Ontario courts are overcrowded, and that a delay in the administration of justice is the result. Premier Frost and hon. Kelso



Roberts, Attorney-General of the province, were asked to appoint the commission. The enquiry would investigate the composition and jurisdiction—territorial, monetary and otherwise—of the various provincial courts, with a view to recommending changes to improve efficiency.

I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General what comments he has to make in that respect. I think he will agree with this observation, that throughout the province there is a substantial body of opinion that this sort of a commission should be set up to make this sort of an enquiry.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition may have been reading from the report in the *Toronto Star*, which I think was a little premature, in this sense—and here I may take the House into my confidence on that subject. I was invited to attend the meeting of the Bar, at its opening session. The council had met earlier in the morning. I went there with a view to discussing this subject with them, and discussing the advisability of having an advisory membership to work on this whole general problem, which had been under consideration by myself and some members of my staff for some months.

What was passed by council was passed before I arrived, and before they knew what I had in mind. I am glad to say that they were very co-operative and rescinded the resolution in the afternoon council meeting. At the moment, the position is that as soon as the pressures of this session are over, I hope to set up a study committee to consider the matter. I have already had the opportunity of being in almost half the county seats in the province in the last 6 months, so I also have a fair background myself of local conditions. However, I feel that it is a very big subject, and a study should be undertaken, and I hope, and feel sure it will be.

MR. OLIVER: Did the hon. Attorney-General find in the study he has made, that there is "serious overcrowding and consequent delay"?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I would not wish to give an unqualified answer. I may say that I was very pleasantly surprised, having heard the statements, and having seen conditions for myself, though there have been some spots which could be greatly improved.

MR. MacDONALD: Could we assume from what the hon. Attorney-General has said, while the Bar has recently passed that resolution, there was agreement on his part and on theirs, that this is a field which should be seriously reviewed?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that this was initiated some weeks back, and it was not a case of waiting for the Bar to move at all.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what relation that had to the report in the *Ontario Government Services* review, headed "Start Review of Administration of Justice Throughout Ontario". That presumably is the one started before it was raised by the Bar Association?

Vote 207 agreed to.

On vote 208:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Public Trustee has a staff of 102. The estates currently under administration number 16,735. The Public Trustee's offices are located at 145 Queen St. West, in the new government building there, and the facilities are regarded as very good.

The Public Trustee has jurisdiction in relation to quite a number of Statutes, some 15 of which are enumerated here, which I will hand to *Hansard* to be put in the record, as I do not think the House would wish me to read them all. They are as follows:

The Crown Administration of Estates Act, RSO 1950, ch. 80.

The Mental Hospitals Act, RSO 1950, ch. 229.

The Charities Accounting Act, RSO 1950, ch. 50.

The Charitable Gifts Act, RSO 1950, ch. 48.

The Cemeteries Act, Statutes of Ontario 1954, ch. 6.

The Child Welfare Act, Statutes of Ontario 1954, ch. 8, and particularly section 64.

The Excheats Act, RSO 1950, ch. 116.

The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, RSO 1950, ch. 241, particularly sections 2, 7, 10 and 12.

The Trustee Act, RSO 1950, ch. 400, particularly section 35.

The Dependents Relief Act, RSO 1950, ch. 101.

The Dower Act, RSO 1950, ch. 109, section 13, as amended by Statutes of Ontario 1952, ch. 24.

The Surrogate Courts Act, RSO 1950, ch. 380.

The Fatal Accidents Act, RSO 1950, ch. 132.

The Corporation Act, Statutes of Ontario 1953, ch. 19, particularly sections 280, 326 and 329.

The Devolution of Estates Act, RSO 1950, ch. 103.

The Public Trustee has the conduct of all litigation arising out of the administration of the estates and the duties imposed upon him by the provisions of the above named Statutes including actions in Tort. He also defends any divorce proceeding against patients in Ontario Hospitals.

Vote 208 agreed to.

On vote 209:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this vote deals with the duties of the office of the Official Guardian. The Official Guardian for the Province of Ontario is the guardian *ad litem* of infants and is required to perform such scheduled duties as may be assigned to him.

The Official Guardian deals also with matters arising under The Devolution of Estates Act, on behalf of infants, and also the Surrogate Courts, the Supreme and County Courts mortgages to the accountant of the Supreme Court, insurance and special legacies.

With respect to special legacies, I might say that where an executor desires to relieve himself of the responsibility of the legacy, he may, by applying directly to the Official Guardian, turn the monies over, to be paid into court to the credit of the minors, the same to be paid out when the minors attain their majorities.

There is also work under The Motor Vehicles Act, and other cases arise under The Matrimonial Causes Act, under family settlements. Under the heading of general comment, I might say that this office is constantly attended by solicitors or by letters asking for assistance in solving matters pertaining to the welfare of infants in respect to their estates or possible rights. This involves a great deal of time of the various solicitors, and I believe this is of paramount help and assistance to the solicitors generally throughout the province.

Working conditions are mentioned as being quite satisfactory in the new building. I have also here the details of the personnel. The total number is 28 and there are agents and sub-agents throughout the province.

Vote 209 agreed to.

On vote 210:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this vote deals with the Accountant of the Supreme Court. This branch is the office to which any money, mortgage, stock or security coming under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Ontario is entrusted for safe-keeping or investment. A finance committee of 3 members controls investments under The Judicature Act; 6 members comprise the staff.

Vote agreed to.

On vote 211:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Vote 211 is the Fire Marshal's Office.

Broadly speaking, the Fire Marshal's Office supervises all fire protection matters which come within provincial jurisdiction, and in particular acts in an advisory capacity and assists municipal

fire departments in all their local problems of fire protection and prevention. Authority in law comes principally from The Fire Marshals Act, which deals with fire inspection and fire investigating authority, and from The Fire Departments Act which deals with operations of municipal fire departments and fire training.

The Fire Marshal's Office also enforces The Lightning Rod Act and is in charge of Civil Defence, under the Order-in-Council establishing the Ontario Civil Defence Committee. In addition the Fire Marshal's Office shares authority with other government departments in the administration of gasoline regulations under the hon. Minister of Highways, the Theatres Act and regulations, under the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and hotels under The Hotel Fire Safety Act and The Liquor Licence Act.

The Fire Marshal's Office is located at 210-216 Huron Street. There are 11 field officers, as well as the staff, and the work of this department is quite substantial. I have a record here of various activities with which I will not deal in detail, unless some hon. member requests it.

Vote 211 agreed to.

On vote 212:

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Vote 212 is in connection with the Inspector of Legal Offices. The personnel of the inspector's office consists of an inspector and an assistant, and a clerical staff of 15, 6 of whom are auditors. The duties are set out in the various Statutes and, briefly, consist of administration and inspection and audit of all Supreme and other court offices, and the personnel who function in these courts, both on the criminal and civil sides, as well as the audit and administration of all Land Titles and Registry offices, and the processing of the appointments of coroners, justices of the peace, notaries public and commissioners for taking affidavits.

All surplus fees from outside offices are channelled through this office, and

after deducting pay rolls and other expenses, the balance is paid to the province. I might say there has been a satisfactory credit balance, in recent years.

There are court and administrative offices to be audited in 48 counties and districts.

MR. MACAULAY: What is the difference between the monthly allowance to judges under vote 212, and the allowance to judges under vote 204?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The monthly allowance to judges is statutory under vote 212. Is that the matter to which the hon. member is referring?

MR. MACAULAY: Yes.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That is by virtue of the Statute.

HON. MR. FROST: It is just Surrogate Court judges, I believe.

MR. MACAULAY: Just Surrogate Court judges?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: It is to County Court judges for services allowed by Statute with relation to both County and Surrogate Courts. There is also an allowance of \$50,000 to judges under The Surrogate Court Act. I think if the hon. member wants the details, they are in the Statutes. The amounts would appear to be \$98,000, and \$50,000.

MR. WINTERMEYER: Has the hon. Attorney-General given any consideration to the establishment of minimum qualifications or standards for the appointment of Registrars of Deeds? Has the hon. Attorney-General any established policy requiring standards or qualifications to be met before appointment?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The policy with respect to appointments? Is that the question?

MR. WINTERMEYER: Appointing Registrars.



HON. MR. ROBERTS: A Registrar of Deeds is appointed in the following manner: individuals are recommended, and processed through the Inspector of Legal Offices. If there is more than one applicant, a selection is eventually made and the appointment made. As far as I know, generally speaking, they have been satisfactory.

MR. MacDONALD: They are recommended by whom?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: By citizens of this province here, there and everywhere, usually legal people. I do not know if the hon. member for York South has submitted any names yet.

Vote 212 agreed to.

On vote 213:

MR. G. INNES (Oxford): May I ask the hon. Attorney-General how many provincial police stations there are in the province, how many are owned by the province, how many stations are to be built in 1956?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That could be answered better by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Griesinger) than by myself. There are 16 districts and 70 detachments.

MR. INNES: How many are slated, does the hon. Attorney-General know?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I do not have the breakdown as between those which are owned and those which are rented. There are 70, as I have mentioned, and there are a number of places where sites have been chosen. In Blind River, there is a great deal of construction going on at the moment, and as rapidly as we can get the clearances, and The Department of Public Works is able to build them, and as the funds are available, we are proceeding to add to the detachment quarters and buildings wherever practical.

I did not intend to conclude without making some comment on vote 213. Total strength of the force at the present time is the highest it has ever been. The rate of pay is also the highest it has

ever been and the force, I think, is at the highest state of efficiency it has ever been.

I would like to say that I hope all hon. members and all their constituents will always regard the Ontario Provincial Police as a friendly force, which is always ready to co-operate with them in law enforcement. They are the friends of the people of this province and certainly not a group to be regarded as anything but friends, unless you come under a criminal classification.

MR. P. MANLEY (Stormont): The hon. Attorney-General has said that the force is stronger than it has ever been. Is it up to the requirements for present-day needs?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I might mention that the Estimates now provide for an amount of money relating to Ontario Provincial Police forces, to something like \$7½ million, which is an increase of almost \$2 million over the last fiscal year. We are moving forward. Of course, with the growth in population, the increase in highways and motor vehicles, the increase of the Ontario Provincial Police has been quite substantial. It is not the sort of situation where I would say it is perfect. We could probably use more officers if we had them. But having in mind the Budget, and the amount of dollars available, I think we are advancing in a very sensible and reasonable way.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I think the hon. Attorney-General might be more specific than that. As I recall the background of this particular matter, I think it was in September the Treasury Board gave the hon. Attorney-General a "go-ahead sign," so far as money was concerned, to hire 150 new constables, unless my memory is wrong. In late November the *Globe and Mail* reported that the hon. Attorney-General had been able to hire only 38 out of 150. How many are there hired now of that authorized 150?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: In answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition: the training of these men is important, as

well as the actual selection. It may interest him to know there were no less than 1,061 applications from which the extra 150 men of the Ontario Provincial Police force were chosen. The full number was reached a few weeks ago. I mentioned it in the House at the time and the force is now at the full authorized strength.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): I noticed in a Press release from Sault Ste. Marie, October 22 last, that "The hon. Kelso Roberts said that helicopters may patrol Ontario highways." He said this when he addressed the annual Convention of the Chief Constables Association of Ontario. Would the hon. Attorney-General care to comment on that, and how he proposes to patrol the highways?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: We had one experimental flight by helicopter on American Thanksgiving Day. Actually, it was fairly late in the season, and it was not possible to draw too many conclusions from that particular experiment. I do think, when the traffic is at its height in the summertime, the use of a helicopter, particularly if the crew and the pilot are trained, can be of considerable help in certain heavily congested sections. I think experience has proven that.

In any event, there have been experiences with it in some states of the United States. I think under certain circumstances it might turn out to be very helpful, particularly in signalling to the ground, clearing traffic jams, and by causing motorists to keep their minds on safety, by reason of the fact they are under observation.

MR. MANLEY: Could the hon. Attorney-General tell us how many provincial police are engaged in policing incorporated villages in the province?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Yes. 61 agreements were in effect as of January, 1956, for policing 63 municipalities according to the provisions of The Police Act. These involve approximately 150 men, and 60 automobiles.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Would the hon. Attorney-General tell us if there are any municipalities which have been asked to be relieved from the contract of supervision under the Ontario Provincial Police?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there have been several released recently. I have a list of agreements terminated during the last year, that is 1955. Would the hon. member like me to read the list?

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): No, just give the number.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: There are about 17 municipalities. As a matter of fact, we welcome the releases, generally speaking, because we can certainly use the men in other ways, if they are no longer needed for that particular job.

MR. MacDONALD: There was quite a list of towns, cities or villages some months ago in which the provincial police had been used, and apparently it was announced that as of such-and-such a date they were not going to be available. The arrangements were renegotiated and they were going to remain. Was that reversal of policy a pertinent one, or is it to permit time for each of these places to build up their own forces?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I would not say there is any change in policy, because we have been entering into agreements with municipalities from month to month right along, but I do not, in any way, object when there is an opportunity to release officers.

MR. MANLEY: Would the hon. Attorney-General tell us how many municipalities have entered into agreements during this past year?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Seventeen have ceased agreements.

MR. MANLEY: How many added agreements?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: There were 4 agreements added in 1955, one with the Township of Neebing, the Improvement District of Red Lake, the Village of Norwich, and the Improvement District of Beardmore.

MR. OLIVER: What happened to the order that was sent out by the hon. Attorney-General's Department, intimating to the various municipalities that after a certain date the agreement would not be continued? That order went out from the hon. Attorney-General's Department, I am quite sure. Has that been rescinded, or what is the situation?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The hon. leader of the Opposition may be referring to something of which I am not aware. Has he the date or the time?

MR. OLIVER: I have not the date with me.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I believe it was before I took office, because I have no recollection of it. At any rate, I am informed the policy is now not to enter into agreements with any of the larger municipalities.

MR. OLIVER: Is there a population level, or how is the line drawn?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I think the population figure is 2,000.

MR. OLIVER: Below that it is O.K.; above that, no.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: I would not say that without qualification. I say we are not inviting new contracts. It is not wide open but we are not taking on any above 2,000 population.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, upon the request of a municipality to remove the provincial police from the area, would the Department of the Attorney-General insist on the minimum of police patrol or supervision in that area, or do they just get out and leave the local people to do it? Do you exercise any control over them?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The local municipality is responsible for providing proper policing in its area. If the provincial police move out by virtue of discontinuance of an agreement, the local municipality must carry on.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): You do not bother any more with it? Do you insist on a minimum of police?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: They undertake to do their own policing, but they have the right to ask for some help.

Vote 213 agreed to.

On vote 214:

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask with regard to the Securities Commission. What supervision or restriction is there on the number of mines which can be organized by a company when, from all appearances, it is straight "stocketeering", rather than a mining development?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say something on this matter.

MR. MacDONALD: It would seem I am more "on the beam" than I thought.

MR. OLIVER: You are bound to hit it sometime.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two about the Securities Commission. The commission is composed of a full-time chairman, Mr. O. S. Lennox, Q.C., and two members, namely Mr. Marriott, Senior Master of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and Mr. H. C. Rickaby, Deputy Minister of Mines. The commission reviews orders and rulings of the chairman. These reviews, or appeals, with few exceptions, involve disciplinary action taken by the chairman, or his declining to accept sole responsibility for the granting of registration in the first instance. The Act also provides for the appointment of a registrar and such



other personnel as may be found necessary. There are at present 37 full-time employees on the staff.

For administrative purposes the commission is divided into 3 divisions: registry, legal and investigation, and audit. The registry division is under the direction of the registrar, with a staff of 10. There are presently—and this may have some bearing on the matter about which the hon. member for York South was talking—there are presently in the neighbourhood of 1,800 registrants in Ontario, including about 1,400 securities salesmen. The registry division is engaged in checking the prospectuses and other statutory material as prescribed by the Act, which must meet the requirements of the Act.

In the processing of this material, it has been found necessary to have two clerks especially trained in the work of checking these filings before they are submitted to the registrar. Every application for registration must be carefully screened and accurate records maintained, which must be checked in the course of annual renewals. We have experienced considerable difficulty in the past in maintaining an adequate clerical staff, but the situation has shown improvement lately.

The assistant registrar directly responsible for this branch of work is a very experienced individual. Under existing conditions the revenue from filings and registrations should be in the neighbourhood of \$175,000 annually. There is the legal and investigation division, the audit division, and a secretary to the commission. This commission is also quartered in the new building across from Osgoode Hall.

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know whether one could readily conclude, from what the hon. Attorney-General has said as to increased staff, that there should be greater supervision over these things. There is one instance of a company downtown which has no fewer than 54 mines, in connection with which they have sold stock to the public, and my information is that not one of the mines is in operation.

I am sure this House would want to facilitate the mining development as much as possible, but it seems to me long before a company gets 54 of them strung out, with none of them in operation, it should be obvious they are not developing mining, but are engaged in what is sometimes referred to as "stock-ateering". Is this increase in staff going to result in a closer supervision of this kind of thing?

HON. MR. ROBERTS: The commission has the duty, of course, of supervising the material which is presented to it, and accepting prospectuses for filing and so on. It is an expert group, including the services of a well known geologist who is engaged on a part-time basis, to assist in the more technical work. If the material is in proper order and if the statement of audit, the engineer's report, and all things which are required, are in proper order, I do not think you could expect the commission, because of the fact that there might be half-a-dozen different applications, to stop it, any more than if some one was opening up half-a-dozen new stores.

MR. MacDONALD: Its prospectus is put out and stock is sold, but the company does not go into operation. If this has gone on 54 times, it strikes me that there is something strange in the procedure.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. member for York South has some particular case in mind, and would like to furnish me with a memorandum about it, I will check it.

MR. MacDONALD: The name of the company is Newkirk.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: He is known to be an established operator, and spends a great deal of money, and also has the capacity to arrange for large amounts of money, so that he could do what you might call a "chain-store business." However, I do not know the facts of the case.

MR. MacDONALD: It seems strange that 54 companies, none of them actually in operation, none of them producing, none of them in production, is what I was trying to say.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: That is a different matter, because very often, starting from "scratch", there could be 100 or 1,000 starts, and none get into production. Getting into production in the mining business is a relatively rare thing. There are very many starts but few "come through," just like the Gold Commissioners stated in their report, which was filed early in the session, the hon. member will see that could happen. I do not think you should condemn any one for that.

If there is something wrong in it, all right, but anybody going into the mining field, as the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Johnston) and other northern hon. members know, takes an extremely great risk in the early stages. I understand the hon. member for Parry Sound, on several occasions, hoped there might be mines close to his own home town, because there were indications of them, but up to now they have not been successful.

MR. MacDONALD: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) wanted to stake out York South, because he thought there was a mine there.

HON. MR. ROBERTS: Because there are 30 or 40 of them does not mean there is anything wrong. If the hon. member has any specific complaint to make I will be glad to have it looked into.

Vote 214 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the committee do now rise, and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report certain resolutions, moves the adoption of the report and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will proceed with the second reading of Bill No. 112, and with other matters on the Order paper.

MR. OLIVER: Are we not going into Estimates tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not think so.

MR. OLIVER: All right.

HON. MR. FROST: If we go into Estimates there is only the one Estimate I might call, that of The Department of Economics. It is only a small Estimate, and we will deal with matters on the Order paper.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 of the clock p.m.









# Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature

---

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
TORONTO  
1956



## CONTENTS

---

**Wednesday, March 7, 1956**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Medical Act, Bill to amend, Mr. Phillips, first reading .....</b>                                   | <b>828</b> |
| <b>Hospital Services Commission of Ontario, Bill to establish,<br/>Mr. Frost, second reading .....</b> | <b>830</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Whicher, agreed to .....</b>  | <b>858</b> |
| <b>Motion to adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to .....</b>   | <b>858</b> |



## LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

---

Speaker: Honourable The Rev. A. W. DOWNER

Roderick G. Lewis, Clerk

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

2 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the sittings of the House on Fridays, following the discussion and suggestions yesterday, I move that the order of February 2 be rescinded, and that this House meet at one o'clock in the afternoon, each Friday, for the balance of the present session.

Mr. Speaker, I do not put that motion forward in any dogmatic way. It is to meet the convenience of the hon. members of the House. Some of them have approached me with that proposal, due to the fact that the trains leave between 3 and 4 o'clock, and they do not like to miss a session of the House.

If any hon. member or members has or have any objection if they will voice them, perhaps we might change our view with reference to the words, "balance of the present session".

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, along the same line, may I say to the hon. members of the House that, for some years past now, we have met, in the concluding weeks of the session,

generally at two o'clock. There is, of course, the objection that when committee meetings are being held, sometimes they run over late in the noon period, in fact, they sometimes overlap, and on occasion it is extremely difficult for hon. members to meet here at two o'clock.

On the other hand, the advantage of meeting at two o'clock is to endeavour to avoid heavy night sessions, which sometimes are pretty onerous, especially when committee meetings are held the following mornings. Therefore, there is some balance between the two.

Mr. Speaker, I may point out that tomorrow, Thursday, it would be a matter of some convenience to those of us who have to go to Ottawa, if the House could meet at two o'clock. I have discussed this with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), in the absence of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and also with the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

Therefore, I will present the appropriate motion, but again, if there are objections, I will request your permission to leave the House, which can meet at the regular hour of 3 o'clock. There are some matters of importance to consider tomorrow and I would prefer to be in the House as much as possible. If it would meet the convenience of the House, I would move that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 2 of the Assembly, the House meet at two o'clock tomorrow afternoon. It is just for the one day.

Motion agreed to.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): Would the hon. Prime Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, if there will be any need for a night sitting tomorrow night?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose a night sitting for tonight nor during the balance of this week. Indeed, we have some very heavy committee meetings, and I think that if we can avoid night sittings, we will do so. Quite frankly, they may be avoided by the expedient of advancing the hour of meeting in the afternoons by one hour, if that can be done with convenience to the hon. members.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

### THE MEDICAL ACT

Hon. M. Phillips moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Medical Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with two principles. The first principle is in section 19a of The Medical Act. The College of Physicians and Surgeons is authorized to establish an educational register for the registration of internes in the institutions mentioned in the section. In other words, this means that we are giving all internes who are carrying on post-graduate courses in our group public hospitals, sanatoria and mental hospitals, the same rights as a physician has while he is in practice; that is, he has those rights within the walls of the institution.

All of these internes are graduates of an approved college of medicine, and they also have passed their council and have a licence to practice.

The Act prescribes at present that every member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons shall pay an annual fee of not less than \$1 and not more than \$5. This amendment will authorize the college to fix the amount of the annual fee by by-law without restriction.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. D. MacDONALD (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter). Speaking in this House on Monday, the hon. Provincial Treasurer stated that Ontario would have no control over the price charged by the Trans-Canada Pipe Line for the distribution of natural gas in Ontario. Yesterday, speaking in the House of Commons, the Rt. hon. C. D. Howe made a statement with regard to natural gas, in the course of which he stated:

I can say simply this: naturally, the sale of gas is not a matter for this government, although in the matter of every sale of gas to a consumer, the rate must obtain the approval of the Ontario Government or the proper agency therefor.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this: who has jurisdiction over the price at which gas will be sold in this province?

HON. DANA PORTER (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the gas that is sold by the Trans-Canada Pipe Line is a commodity which is carried through a pipe line which is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. We have no control over the prices they charge for that gas, but we have control, through the Fuel Board, once that gas is sold to a utility here. It comes within the local jurisdiction from that point on. The Fuel Board is concerned as to the prices charged for gas to the ultimate consumer by the utility.

Mr. Speaker, as I have explained on previous occasions in this House, the price is determined by the price which has to be paid to the Trans-Canada Pipe Line in the first instance, and the cost of distributing that gas from that point on.

The purpose of controlling the price of the gas to the consumer, through the utilities, arises because in most places—I suppose in all places—a local distribution system is a monopoly, and it is in the public interest that they should not

charge an exorbitant rate to the consumer, that is, a rate which would give them excessive profits at the expense of the consumer, because of that monopolistic position.

I may say that in the first year of operation of any natural gas system which involves the transporting of gas from Alberta to Ontario, it is doubtful whether any of these distributing agencies will be able to make any profit at all, certainly not any exorbitant profit. That may not be for some years to come.

The ordinary competitive forces between other fuels and gas, I have not the slightest doubt will determine the lowest possible economic price at which gas can be obtained, and it will probably not be necessary to rely too heavily upon rates fixed by the Fuel Board in the early stages. But as far as gas negotiations between the Trans-Canada and the utility companies here, Trans-Canada Pipe Line is under full control.

I think probably what the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe had in mind was that at the present time, as I understand it, the Federal Government does not attempt to control the price of gas which is being negotiated between the Trans-Canada Pipe Line and utility companies or other purchasers of gas directly from that line.

It may be in future they may find it will be necessary to do that, but at the present time I think they are taking the position—and I can be corrected if I am wrong—that it will be necessary, in order to obtain the largest possible distribution of this gas, to allow the company to negotiate in its best interest to secure sufficient revenue to make the line pay. In order to do that, in the first place, they will have to keep the price of gas low enough so that the ultimate consumers will seek to buy it, and be able to buy it. That, in itself, will keep the price down to the economic limit.

MR. MacDONALD: May I ask a supplementary question? I do not want to take a great deal of time on this, but Trans-Canada Pipe Line, for instance, may make an agreement with a large industrial consumer, for instance, Inter-

national Nickel Company. It is the consumer, and there is no intervening utility. That price will then come under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Fuel Board.

HON. MR. PORTER: No, we have no control over the activities of the Trans-Canada Pipe Line.

MR. MacDONALD: Nobody has?

HON. MR. PORTER: Any more than we have over the railway rates. For instance, in connection with the rates to carry goods from Gravenhurst to Toronto; that is entirely within Ontario, but the rates can be fixed only by the Transport Board in Ottawa, because the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are inter-provincial, and national in their scope. They come entirely within the jurisdiction of Ottawa, and Ottawa has complete control, so far as they wish to exercise it, over those rates. The same thing applies to gas rates when they are fixed by an inter-provincial undertaking.

MR. YAREMKO: It would be interesting to hear the rest of the remarks by Rt. hon. Mr. Howe.

MR. MacDONALD: Good. After we have the full story, it will be interesting to get his complete comments on that.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like this afternoon to welcome 4 groups to this Assembly; first, a group of 65 Air Corps students now stationed at London, Ont., made up of students from the Royal Air Force, the French Air Force, the Royal Norwegian Air Force, the Royal Danish Air Force, the Royal Netherlands Air Force, Belgium Air Force and the Royal Canadian Air Force. We also welcome a group of women from Bonar Presbyterian Church; students from Welland High and Vocational School, and a group of students from the Toronto Teachers' College.

Orders of the day.



HON. MR. PORTER: Before the Orders of the day, and following up what the hon. member has asked: he has quoted a certain extract from a statement made by the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe. I understand there is more to that quotation. The hon. member stopped at a certain point and I am sure the House would be very much interested in hearing the whole thing.

MR. MacDONALD: I will give the rest. I have not the full statement with me. I brought the relevant quotation with regard to fixing prices.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member always brings just one or two sentences.

MR. MacDONALD: I have no objection to telling the House the rest of the statement. Rt. hon. Mr. Howe was disputing, for the moment, Mr. M. J. Coldwell's quotation that the price charged to the International Nickel Company would be 20 cents more than the price charged in Chicago. He said it would only be 10 cents more. We will see, when the contracts are signed, whether it is 20 cents or 10 cents, although the fact which does come out of it is that nobody has control over the price.

Here is the case of the International Nickel Company. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has raised the point and if he wants to debate it, we will.

The International Nickel Company is a large buyer. You could almost describe them as a "wholesaler." The International Nickel Company will be a large industrial consumer of gas. Here is an industrial consumer of gas in the Province of Ontario, and the price is not going to come within the jurisdiction of the Ontario Fuel Board. The Rt. hon. Mr. Howe says it is not under his jurisdiction.

HON. MR. PORTER: He did not mention "jurisdiction," according to the statement the hon. member made. He said they were not controlling it.

MR. MacDONALD: I shall quote it again:

Naturally the sale of gas is not a matter for this government, although in regard to every sale of gas to a consumer, the rate must obtain the approval of the Ontario Government or the proper agency thereof.

It means if Trans-Canada Pipe Line sells to International Nickel it must get the approval of the Fuel Board of Ontario, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer says "no."

HON. MR. PORTER: It is quite clear what the Rt. hon. Mr. Howe had in mind when he was speaking to that.

MR. MacDONALD: It is not clear to me.

HON. MR. PORTER: Nothing is ever clear to the hon. member. He has given us a piecemeal account of some statement made in the House of Commons. He has not the full statement. If he had, it would be very interesting, and would put it into proper perspective. But he has not got it, and we have not it here at the moment.

MR. MacDONALD: That is blurring the point at issue.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 13, 18, 21 and 25. I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) I am doing very well in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

## THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION OF ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to establish The Hospital Services Commission of Ontario."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in asking the House to give second reading to this Bill to establish the Hospital Services Commission of Ontario may I

say that, for very apparent reasons, I take more than ordinary care in the presentation of this matter. In order to present the problem in a very concise way, keep it limited to the essentials, and not to be drawn into subsidiary issues which might be time-consuming, I have this matter reduced to writing, a copy of which I propose to give to each hon. member of the House, together with certain material to which I shall refer in a moment.

The purpose of this Bill is to develop and insure the continuance of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals and related health facilities.

For upwards of two years now there has been in progress an intensive study in this province of hospital care insurance. Any such insurance plan must be built upon hospital services and administration. This is the foundation. Any structure to be built will only be as secure as its foundation. The studies we have made and the experience of other jurisdictions all point to this fact. It is therefore desirable, and indeed necessary, that a commission be appointed and organized to develop the important functions contained in this Bill, principally in sections 7 and 8.

My remarks will be largely directed to certain provisions in sections 7 and 8 of the Bill.

The studies we have undertaken have been immeasurably aided by the Ontario Hospital Association and Blue Cross, which is a subsidiary of that association. Sitting on our study committee have been Mr. David Ogilvie, director of the Blue Cross, and Mr. Stanley Martin, executive secretary. We have, therefore, in a very real way had the advantage of the experience of the Ontario public general hospitals. May I at this time thank these two officials, as well as the board of directors of the Blue Cross, Professor Malcolm Taylor of the University of Toronto, and the members of our own public service, for their invaluable assistance on this important problem.

I should like to emphasize that the provisions of the Bill, particularly sec-

tion 7(d) containing powers to administer a system of hospital care insurance, including diagnostic services, out-patient and home care services and section 8(e), to establish a division of hospital care insurance, that these two sections which are bound to excite comment, of course, in the present state of this highly important matter, these two sections in no way commit the province to enter into a hospital insurance plan.

I should like to lay before the House what has been done in relation to that matter, a matter which is mentioned and is involved in this Bill and for which this Bill provides the basis or the framework for the administration of such a system.

I propose to give to the House a great deal of material which might, in turn, be submitted to the Committee on Health, which I would like to have meet on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week. However, I shall mention these today, so that the hon. members of the House will have the fullest opportunity to examine into this highly important problem.

That is the point which has been mentioned, as I said before, in the Speech by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. To go back into that matter and give a concise statement—and I assure the hon. members of this House that the statement will be concise—that at the agenda-making session of the Federal-Provincial Conference, on April 26 last, I made this statement:

This very important subject deserves the consideration of this conference. It is a matter which has been widely discussed and this conference can do a great deal to clarify the issues involved. It is generally recognized that any health insurance plan of a broad nature should have both federal and provincial participation. We suggest that the whole question be intensively studied, with a view to arriving at the following:

(a) A health insurance plan in which there would be both federal and provincial participation and in which the fullest details of the extent

of the coverage to the individual would be given.

(b) Estimates as accurate as possible of the cost of such a plan and how that cost would be shared—

(i) By the individual or family;

(ii) By the Provincial Government;

(iii) By the Federal Government.

(c) How the moneys to support such a plan would be raised.

(I am fully cognizant of the fact that it would have to be considered in the light of the problems and fiscal position of Canada and her provinces.)

(d) In what manner and under what conditions a health plan could be proceeded with in stages in accordance with the medical and hospital organization and the financial position of each province.

(I think we have learned in these conferences that the provinces cannot all be put into one mould. Canada is just not made that way.)

(e) In the stages suggested in (d), what priority could be given to meeting the crippling financial burdens imposed on the individual and family by prolonged illness and affliction.

(f) In what way the plans established by individual provinces could be integrated into a federal-provincial health insurance plan.

The study of health insurance would help to clarify the thinking of all in a field in which there unquestionably is a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion. A plan could be evolved in this way that would enable the whole structure to be built efficiently in stages and within the financial capacities of the various levels of government to pay for them. Health insurance has many important financial implications, not only for the provinces and the Federal Government but for the individual; and since it is one of the great objectives

in the field of human betterment, it should be placed on the agenda for study, with a view to producing a sound, workable plan with which we could proceed.

That is the end of the statement which I made in Ottawa on April 26 last.

I will proceed with this statement by saying that, since that time, most intensive and far-reaching studies have been made. On October 3 last, the results of a number of these studies were placed before the Federal-Provincial Conference, and again on January 2 an additional comprehensive study was submitted to the conference's Committee on Health.

At this meeting, on January 26, the Federal Government made certain proposals. I now propose to give to the House a memorandum containing these statements, containing a condensed review of some of our studies entitled "A Brief Outline of a Comprehensive Hospital Services Programme—a Study Document," and an analysis of the Federal Government's proposals of January 26, 1956. I wish to emphasize this information is for study only.

This is dated March 6. It is the very latest study by those gentlemen whom I have mentioned, and who will come before the committee of the House to give explanations and be questioned in relation to the very many phases of this highly-important matter.

This document is strictly factual. It contains the actual statements which were made on April 26, October 3, and January 23 last, by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It also contains the statement of the Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent at the Provincial Conference on October 3, his subsequent statement of January 26, and a summary of the statement of the hon. federal Minister of Health, Mr. Martin, after the conference of January 26. That statement was never released, but the hon. Minister did make certain statements to the newspapers which were almost identical with the statement of Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent, therefore, it has been used in a summarized form.



This contains a brief outline, but I will say that every effort has been made to reduce this matter to an understandable form.

The studies are voluminous and difficult to follow, so members of the committee under the chairmanship of Mr. George Tattle, and, to a very large extent, under the direction of Prof. Taylor and Mr. Gathercole, boiled them down to a point where they comprise, I think, the salient and necessary features.

I now propose to give to the House a memorandum containing a condensed review of some of our studies, entitled "A Brief Outline of a Comprehensive Hospital Services Programme," and an analysis of the Federal Government's January 26, 1956, proposals. This document refers to laboratory and radiological diagnostics services in connection with a hospital care plan, a home care plan, and proposed methods of financing. There is, also, a factual analysis of the proposals of the Federal Government for hospital care, including insurance; the Ontario proposals, all of which were submitted for study purposes; the federal proposals of January 26, the implications for Ontario, and financial calculations. This document is a highly valuable reference document and will be given to the House within a very few minutes.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister would hardly say the proposals of the Federal Government and those of the Provincial Government fall into the same category?

HON. MR. FROST: That is quite right. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition will agree, when he peruses these documents, that this is a very factual calculation, so that the hon. members of the House will have the most complete information possible when the matter is discussed in committee. I propose this Bill and this memorandum be referred to the Committee on Health, which will sit next week, so that this study document can be amplified by other information.

It is planned to have present Mr. Gathercole, the Deputy Minister of The Department of Economics, with those who have been associated in this task, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) and his Deputy, and other important officials of that department, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter), and certain members of the Treasury Board and the Budget Committee. In addition, there will be the committee which has been studying this matter intensively over the last few months, consisting of the hon. Vice-Chairman of Hydro, Mr. George Tattle, Prof. Taylor, Mr. David Ogilvie and Mr. Stanley Martin, who represent Blue Cross.

The purpose of this submission is not to obtain recommendations from the Committee on Health, but to give the hon. members of the House, and the public, as much practical information as time will allow on this very involved problem.

Please bear in mind what I said at Ottawa last April:

The study of health insurance would help to clarify the thinking of all in a field in which very unquestionably there is a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion.

If wise decisions are to be made, they must be made, not on the basis of misunderstanding, but of understanding, where there can be an appraisal of all the issues by this House and by the people.

The Committee on Health consists of 42 hon. members, and will constitute a forum where this matter can be brought into the light in a way, we hope, which will promote understanding. There are many questions which hon. members will want to ask. I think this will be clear when the agenda I shall propose to this House in a few minutes will be considered. It will involve the consideration of this particular Bill and the reasons involved. In general, they are too numerous and too complex to be discussed in detail here. There are

two, however, to which I would like to refer briefly.

First, what is under discussion now is not a health plan in the general sense; we are dealing only with a hospital and diagnostic services plan with the fundamentals of hospital care at public-ward level, without any limitation on the period of stay in hospital. That should interest the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), who is very much interested, as are we all, in the problems, and difficulties of catastrophe as related to health.

On the other hand, many insurance policies which, while limiting the time of stay, and other matters, provide coverages, such as semi-private care, and other benefits, which are additional to those which are contemplated in the plan at present being studied. That will interest the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. T. D. Thomas), where there are many thousands of citizens in the community covered by the General Motors Plan, which goes, perhaps not far beyond, but has coverages which this plan does not involve, and these people are obviously concerned, and so are some 3½ million people in this province, who carry various forms of coverage.

Obviously, the problem of integration with other plans is one of great magnitude, and will have to be considered. In the letters I have received in the last few months, I have had as many questions raised on that as any other aspect of health insurance, with the exception of the subject of the treatment of tubercular and mentally-ill people.

The unlimited-stay feature of our plan is very important. It is estimated that the rates of private carriers would have to be at least doubled to provide the same coverage. Most of the insurance plans are limited, I think some of the Blue Cross plans run up to 201 days, some of them are much less, and it is less with other policies, and there are many hundreds of them in the province.

Secondly, the federal proposals of January 26 last preclude any insured benefits for tuberculosis and mental illness. One of the points in which this

government has been greatly concerned and interested, is the matter of hospital stay, which is catastrophic in its effects. Personally, I cannot think of anything more catastrophic than the long stays in hospital occasioned by mental or tubercular illness, and it would seem to me that they have to be included in the coverage. I have had more letters from the public on this phase than on any other, and possibly that is true of other hon. members of this House. The federal Minister of National Health and Welfare in speaking in London on March 2, is reported to have said:

Mental illness is one of the greatest problems in our society today, a problem which those of us in the health field and at all levels of government are constantly aware of.

That is the end of the quotation which appeared, not only in the London *Free Press*, but in the morning newspaper here. This is true, of course; it is also very largely applicable to tuberculosis. How then can we have a plan which is designed, in one phase, to guard against catastrophe, if we omit these two diseases from our coverage? Despite what the Federal Government proposed in that regard, it seems to me that in all practical common sense, we have to include that in the coverage here in Ontario, and it obviously means that the people of Ontario and the Government of Ontario would have to bear that portion of the cost.

MR. OLIVER: Like we do now.

HON. MR. FROST: I will come to that. The programme of services which the Federal Government is willing to share is greatly revised from the offer of 1945, which was based upon the finding of a committee of the House of Commons, and a draft Bill which was prepared in 1943. The 1945 offer, as will be recalled, covered the entire range of health services. The 1956 offer is limited to diagnostic services and active treatment in hospital, excluding mental illness, tuberculosis, and home care.

On the financial side, the offer is also drastically reduced from that of 1945.

The Federal Government offered to pay 60 per cent. of the estimated cost of the wider programme which is borne out by the table which I shall give here in a moment. The 1956 offer in the following formula is roughly one which reduces the contribution in the high-cost provinces, such as Ontario, and increases the contribution in the low-cost provinces.

The formula is roughly this: 25 per cent. of the average per capita costs for hospital services in Canada, as a whole, plus 25 per cent. of the average per capita cost in the province itself; this to be multiplied by the total of the population covered. In Ontario, this would work out at between 47 per cent. and 48 per cent. of a portion of the programme only. That is the portion covered by the January proposal, which would amount in Ontario this year to about 35 per cent. federal contribution on the basis of our proposed programme of hospitalization, including mental illness and tuberculosis.

There is a very great deal of difference between the 60 per cent. contribution proposed in 1945 and which continued without change until the conference of 1955, following which in January last the new proposal was made.

I point out that the 1945 proposal was made arising out of a report by a committee of the House of Commons, and which continued unchanged, and I presume was the basis upon which the hon. leader of the Opposition made his health proposals on May 5 last in London. It must have been premised on that, because there was no other offer made from 1945 until January 26, 1956.

One of the worrisome features of this problem is the fact that hospital costs in Ontario for at least the next 5 years, and probably longer, are going to increase. With the introduction of a form of universal hospital coverage, these increases will be accelerated. Those things come from the experience of all other jurisdictions, and the most complete information will be given to the House. The federal formula will militate against this province, due to the fact that a factor of national coverage is intro-

duced which will mean that with the acceleration of our costs, the percentage of federal contribution to the total programme will become less. As will be seen from the following table, on present calculations, approximately one-third is borne by the Federal Government, and two-thirds by Ontario taxpayers.

It must be recognized that with the increase of hospital costs, the provincial percentage will inevitably increase. The main cause of this increase is our industrial expansion, which creates a high hospital cost province. We are the victims in this, because of the very growth and prosperity of our province, and when I say this, I am repeating what was said last night. It is one of the inevitable consequences of bringing together large industries and heavily populated areas that costs do increase. That is a matter of history and an additional factor in hospital costs.

Another factor which increases costs is where hospital insurance on a universal basis is introduced in the jurisdiction, undoubtedly it makes it so that more people go to hospitals, and use the facilities and, therefore, the cost on a unit basis becomes larger. However, that is a point which can be discussed with the committee. That is one of the things which concerned the aim of this Bill, to endeavour to keep these hospital costs under control. If we were to permit hospital costs to get out of control, if we were under a hospital insurance plan, our plight would be very difficult, and that is one of the primary reasons for this Bill.

It does seem unfair that this province, with problems caused by reason of 50 per cent. of Canadian industry being located here, should get exactly the same per capita share of corporation and personal income taxes as the other provinces which receive equalization grants, and then have the same formula work in reverse to give us a lower percentage of hospital costs, merely because our hospital costs are higher than the national average.

As usual Ontario, with the greatest growth problems, will receive the least generous treatment tax-wise, and the



least contribution towards our hospital costs. As I have pointed out, inevitably, year by year, the federal percentages of contribution will be less, and the burden will become greater on this province.

Although studies have been made of the discrepancies between the present limited federal proposals, and what would seem to us to be the minimum comprehensive coverage which should apply in this province, these matters might better be discussed in committee, where the pros and cons of each matter can be considered in detail. I refer to the matter of home care, out-patient diagnosis and things of that sort, a full tuberculosis and mental health coverage, all of which can be discussed in committee, and the views of those who have studied these things for years can be made available.

I might refer here, however, to the cost of administration. The Federal Government does not consider this as a shareable cost, and to my mind, that is insupportable. It is naive to assume that hospital insurance can be administered without some comprehensive administration costs. We estimate this item alone at \$7½ million, which is the estimate of the people who have studied this matter. My own estimate, in view of experience in administration, is to have a coverage involving a possible 5¼ million people. If that can be done for \$7½ million a year, I would say it was a very fine system of administration.

However, those who have considered this matter have not "loaded" nor distorted any items. It is as factual as can be given to this House, and to the people of Ontario.

Now, the percentage is small, but when it is applied to a programme which, in the first year, ran into \$190 million, it is a very considerable amount. The House will readily see that when you talk about 60 per cent. of a comprehensive programme proposed in 1945, then refer in this House to 25 per cent. of that same programme, and that 25 per cent. which runs into tens of millions of dollars, even one per cent. makes a very great deal of difference.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, I understood the hon. Prime Minister to say the cost for Ontario was \$190 million?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, yes, \$190 million. As I have said, one per cent. makes a great deal of difference. In the conception of a national health programme, to which the Federal Government has given a great deal of publicity over the years, I feel that there should be a recognition and a national sharing of inescapable administrative costs, and I say this quite frankly to all hon. members of the House, regardless of Party.

Mr. Speaker, the following table sets out the matter more specifically, and its significance can be grasped at a glance. The first column shows the total cost of a comprehensive programme, and refers to the type of programme we believe to be necessary in Ontario. I think hon. members will all agree that it is the minimum we could have in this province. The second column "Federal Share in Parts Participated In," refers to the portions of that programme towards which the Federal Government would contribute. The column headed "Provincial Share" is that which would have to be financed from provincial taxes. Under these 3 headings there are the following items: active treatment, convalescent, chronic care, and diagnostic services. These would cost \$137.7 million in the first year.

The federal contribution would be \$65.6 million in the first year, and the provincial share would be \$72.1 million. Emergency and out-patient treatment would cost \$2½ million. That is one of the things which keeps hospital costs down. There would be no federal contribution, so the provincial cost would be \$2½ million.

Depreciation on hospital buildings is \$4.1 million at the present time. That is a point hon. members are always battling against. As is known, we have been passing votes in connection with obsolescence, and deferred maintenance for some time for some of our hospitals.

The minimum for Ontario carried on a yearly basis would work out at \$4.1 million. There would be no federal contribution, so that item cannot be carried out under the provincial share method.

Mental costs at the present time in this province—that is, without capital cost—are \$26 million. The federal contribution is \$1 million, and the provincial share, therefore, would be the balance amounting to \$25 million.

In regard to tuberculosis, the provincial cost is presently \$7 million. There would be no federal contribution, and our cost, therefore, would be \$7 million.

In regard to home care, that is on a limited regional basis, and is not possible in all areas of the province. It might be possible in closely-populated areas such as we have here, or such as exist in Waterloo County, for instance, and probably in Windsor and some other places.

This point has been estimated more on a piloting or experimental basis, at a cost of \$5.3 million. There is no federal contribution, and we in Ontario have to carry this item in its entirety.

In regard to administration; the cost is \$7.5 million, which I think is low. However, that is the figure we have been given. As will be seen, none of these figures are inflated. The total cost would be \$190.1 million in the first year, the federal contribution would be \$66.6 million and the provincial share, to be raised in the province, in any of the ways I shall describe in a moment, would be \$123.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, on that point I would refer hon. members, when they receive this document, to page 54, which gives a summary of similar costs carried forward to 1960. I can assure hon. members that those figures are a cause of some concern.

For 1956, the estimated cost is \$190.1 million. In 1957, we estimate the cost will be \$213.5 million.

MR. R. WHICHER (Bruce): Is that the gross for Ontario?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. It is \$213.5 million. In 1958, it is estimated that it will be \$237.8 million, and in 1959, \$266.4 million. It is estimated that for the year 1960, the cost will be \$298.5 million. These figures are very high, and I can assure the House that they deserve—as I know they will receive from hon. members and from our people—the most thorough consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not looking at this problem pessimistically, as I shall show in a moment, that I want to put the true facts to the people.

MR. WHICHER: Those figures which have been quoted are the gross costs for Ontario, in the years stated? For example, we are now paying the tuberculosis and mental costs?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be helpful to the hon. members if this information was distributed now. It may help to answer some of the questions.

MR. WHICHER: I am referring to the net cost, because we are now paying tuberculosis and mentally-ill costs, and also depreciation.

HON. MR. FROST: I will give a break-down. Active treatment—that is something in which the hon. member will be interested—in the figures I gave a moment ago, for 1956 amounting to \$111.4 million. In 1957, our very best estimate is \$126.1 million, and in 1958, \$141.3 million. In case I am going too rapidly, I will send over a copy of the statement to the hon. member in a moment. The cost for 1959 is estimated at \$157.3 million, and for 1960, at \$173.8 million. That is in part what the Federal Government would contribute to.

Undoubtedly, our hospital costs are going to rise, and be accelerated when we enter into a plan, if we do. With the tagging on of a national average there, our costs in Ontario inevitably go up faster than others, and the deterrent effect of the national average is going to pull down the 47 per cent. or 48 per cent. contribution to that to a much lower figure, and that must be taken into

consideration. If the national average were to run against all custom, and were to keep up with our average, of course that would not happen. If the national average exceeded our average, it would be helpful to us, but since 1867, I cannot think of many times that has happened, and I cannot see how it would happen here, for this reason:

There are two provinces, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, which already have health plans and they have already gone through the period of hospital inflation and their high costs are already there. It is extremely doubtful that, with the 3 other provinces which may come into this plan, Ontario making the sixth, those 3 others would tend to increase the national average in a way which would anything but adversely affect this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is an opinion. I am not putting it over dogmatically, but I say it is something which should be considered. I would say this to the hon. members and perhaps specifically to the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer), who spoke yesterday and delivered an able and thoughtful address. I agreed with part of that address, and on part of it I reserve the right to disagree, but nevertheless I thought it was a very thoughtful contribution. One of the things the hon. member mentioned was that there should be a committee of this House to study the tax sources of this province, and what is going to happen in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in what the hon. member said. I would like a very factual and objective survey of our position. I think it wise that we should look at it from that angle. As to whether a select committee is the solution I do not know; but I can assure him that in this Assembly I will give him the fullest opportunity to survey the problem. I would ask him to go to this committee and ask questions, because there never has been a matter of greater financial magnitude which we have considered in this province than the problem which is before the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other matters to which I should like to refer. For instance, in the matter of mental hospitals: we might as well recognize the fact that the cost we have to meet this year is \$26 million. Next year, it will increase to \$31.5 million. These are not capital costs.

I notice that hon. Mr. Martin made a statement in London last Friday, in which he pointed out that for an extension of some 600 beds which is in our Estimates for this year, the contribution of his government would be about \$1 million. I can say that the \$1 million the Federal Government may contribute would be offset several times over by our costs. We have the capital costs in addition. We should not avoid these things. We might as well face them frankly. Next year, our mental hospital costs are going to increase by \$5½ million, despite anything we may do. In the year 1958, our costs will be \$36.5 million, and in 1959, \$43.2 million. In 1960, it will be about double the present outlay of \$26 million, amounting to \$50.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this is something we cannot avoid. I do not think we could have a comprehensive plan. We have to take away the fear of mental illness and tuberculosis which people have and the stigma as well. People who suffer from mental illness are perhaps just as sick—perhaps more so—than many other people, and they must be so regarded. If we treat them in that way, we might do something toward the elimination of worry, to reduce the incidence of mental disease in this province.

There is one bright spot in this table. It is in the matter of tuberculosis sanatoria, where, by reason of the "wonder drugs," it appears that our costs in 1960 will not be any greater than in 1956, which is about \$7 million. One might ask why the costs would not continue to decline. The reason is that we are giving a wider coverage to our population in regard to tuberculosis diagnosis. With the commencement of the hospital plan, of course, it would receive



wider attention than it does now. However, we are considerably expanding this sphere in relation to the diagnosis of the population. At this session, I think it will be extended to the inmates of the reform institutions, which I presume will receive the approval of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

With the increased diagnostic facilities our experts feel it is improbable that the present load will be reduced, although they feel, with some confidence, that it will not be any significant increase.

Now, it will be seen that while the Federal Government would contribute, in 1956, between 47 and 48 per cent. of the costs of public care and general diagnostic services, its share of the overall programme, including mental and tuberculosis services, and cost of administration, would be only about 35 per cent.

I pointed out with some justification that it is a far cry from the 1945 level of the federal proposals, to the 1956 level, and a far cry from the representations your humble servant made on April 26, when I went to Ottawa, believing that they would give 60 per cent. of a comprehensive programme—as they ought to do.

Mr. Speaker, here is a point to which I would like all hon. members—and especially the hon. member for Waterloo North—to give consideration. On the basis of the year 1957, Ontario's share of this programme, which is inescapable, if it cannot be changed by way of negotiation—and I am always optimistic in that regard—would be \$123.5 million. That is Ontario's share on the basis of this year's figures. That totals up to the figures I mentioned when referring to page 54 of this submission. That amount would increase to a marked extent in the ensuing years, and would have to be raised from taxes levied on our people, whether by way of general taxes or in premiums which are a form of a direct and specific tax.

No doubt that would be represented in this way. It would have to come partly from general revenues or general

taxation and, secondly, partly by a premium which would be charged on every individual or head of a family. In Saskatchewan, they have adopted both methods. In British Columbia, their plans were also started on this basis, but the premium collection was abandoned, and in its place an increase in sales tax was introduced.

In Saskatchewan, a portion of the cost of the plan which is raised by general revenue is met by way of sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, those are factual statements. The House, in its wisdom, has to take these matters into consideration, in view of the other problems which this province has to solve. Obviously, we will be faced with very much greater outlays for education and also for roads.

I might say to the hon. member for Waterloo North, who spoke yesterday about the increase in the net debt, this is a matter of concern. I was interested in the *Star's* cartoon about the "goose which lays the golden egg." This is one of the things which can kill the goose. At the present time, we are paying about 60 per cent. of our capital costs from current revenues. It may be debatable that this is a heavy burden on the present generation, but, on the other hand, we have to keep our credit rating, and we have to strike an even balance if possible.

We are going to be faced with added costs. It would be very easy, and perhaps in some ways very sound today, to increase our provincial spending from the present \$400 million level to \$500 million, which would involve contributing more to municipalities and to education. That is a very desirable thing. This must be taken as a part of the general fiscal problem of the province.

I should like to pay tribute here to what has been done in Saskatchewan. On saying that, I want to point out their conditions are totally different from ours. Their population is roughly 800,000, and it remains constantly at about that figure. Regina is the largest city, which is probably not any larger than the City of Windsor—perhaps not

as large. There are many small communities in the province. Their plan is based upon a municipal participation where they have Legislation for the collection of premiums and have administration at a municipal level, which, I would think, would probably be quite impossible in a province such as ours, where we have great upsurges of population, with the creation and growth of communities almost overnight.

Nevertheless, Saskatchewan with the problem it has had to face has done a very workmanlike job. But to think it can be applied to our situation is quite impossible. Our situation with  $5\frac{1}{4}$  million people—in this city there is a population in excess of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million people—and with the communities springing up, such as in the Manitouwadge, Algoma, Bancroft and a host of other areas and growing overnight their system would be quite impossible.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): May I ask a question with respect to the collecting agency? I think the hon. Prime Minister should consider that angle in relation to the obstacles in Ontario. The present system in Saskatchewan is collection by the municipalities. The percentage of collection is 3 per cent. for the first \$100,000 collected, and from then on  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., so I think it is a very good system.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right, I agree with the hon. member. It might be there are certain municipalities in Ontario—perhaps a large number without great populations—which might deal with that problem. You might find, for instance, some of the townships, such as Port Perry, would deal with the problem; but in a city such as Oshawa, it might not be practical. That is our problem in Ontario. In Saskatchewan their collecting is done by the municipalities on a percentage basis. I think the hon. member mentioned 3 per cent. as the cost of the plan.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): There are also other agencies, you know.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, in Regina they have their own government office, because the city would not handle it, and we might have to make similar arrangements in this province.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): We could try, anyway.

HON. MR. FROST: These are matters of administration which cannot be overlooked. In Saskatchewan they are financing it partly by premium, and partly by general contributions which comes mainly from a sales tax which is levied for both education and hospital care. In British Columbia they abandoned the premium system, and adopted a 5 per cent. sales tax, 3 per cent. of which is applied to the cost of this plan.

Those are matters of grave concern into which the hon. members of this House should examine. In considering health insurance, we are dealing with a matter of immense financial magnitude, the determination of which must depend upon public understanding as to what it is proposed to do, and how it is to be paid for. It is altogether desirable that this entire matter should be taken out of the realm of uncertainty and placed where it can be thoroughly examined and considered by our people.

Since April 26, 1955, a very great deal has been accomplished along these lines, and today we are in a position, for the first time, to give the whole matter objective scrutiny, and consideration, such as has never been possible before. These figures are brought up to Monday, March 6. The consideration of this matter by this House, the Committee on Health of this House, the Press, and elsewhere, will do much to place it where public understanding and viewpoint can be secured constructively. I am sure great benefit and wise decision will come from this course.

In Ontario, we have about one-third of Canada's population and about one-half of its manufacturing industry. We are growing rapidly, and our problems are changing quickly. Within our province we have great population changes,

not only in the rapid growth of our older communities, but in the new ones springing up almost overnight. This growth presents problems of hospital services administration—problems which are in many cases peculiar to ourselves—the course and magnitude of which are, to a large extent, uncharted. These problems call for the most earnest consideration and the very best type of administration to deal with them.

The costs are so large that everything possible must be done to eliminate mistakes. An error of point one of one per cent. could involve very large sums of money, probably in the millions. It is, therefore, essential that we take our time and build soundly and wisely.

In presenting these studies to you I want to avoid making the problem appear so large that we shrink from it as being impossible. We have accomplished things before which seemed impossible of attainment. The St. Lawrence Seaway is under construction, and there are many other things which we have done.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): We can do it.

HON. MR. FROST: There is nothing we cannot do within our jurisdiction and within our limitations, if we approach them soundly and wisely.

On the other hand, we must avoid skipping lightly over difficulties and problems and making them appear to be easy, when in fact they are not. The minute you do that you are in difficulty. You have to bear those two things in mind. I counsel hon. members of this House against taking either of these views. This is an immense problem, and its implications should be recognized and widely known.

It will be by no means easy to develop the programme I have outlined. But I am satisfied it can be developed, provided we build soundly and firmly, having regard always for the principles of good business, and not allow ourselves to be hurried into unsound positions, and are able to work out satisfactory arrangements with the Federal Government.

I think there is a great deal of room for a change in the 60 per cent. which has shrunk overnight to 35 per cent., and I think there is a possibility of a change in that area.

MR. MacDONALD: It sounds like the governments grants to education, which shrunk too.

HON. MR. FROST: Again I say, if we are able to work out satisfactory arrangements with the Federal Government we can make progress, and that our objective of a system of basic hospital insurance can be realized.

I propose to place an agenda before the Committee on Health, and I should like to describe it very briefly. In this way we will provide the place and the method for bringing this very important and much misunderstood problem out into the open, where its implications will be made known.

We could have 3 days' sitting in the Health Committee without a programme during which questions might be asked about hospitalization, involving a number of issues, with the result that we would come away from the committee perhaps not knowing a great deal more than when we went there. Therefore, I propose that the agenda should be along these lines, and I will briefly describe to the House the purpose for it:

1. Ontario's Statements and Studies.

(a), (b) and (c) are statements made by myself at the Conference on April 26, 1955. I assure, particularly hon. members of the Opposition they were very good statements and I would suggest hon. members should read them. They are quite as good as the statement I made in 1954, which was read, in fact, by the hon. member for Waterloo North.

(b) A statement made on October 3, which is contained in this book, and a statement made by the hon. Provincial Treasurer at the conference on January 23, 1956.

Then there are the federal statements, the statement of the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. St. Laurent, at the conference on October 3, the



statement of the hon. Prime Minister of Canada in the House of Commons on January 26, taken from *Hansard* and (c) a summary of proposals made by the chairman, the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin), on January 26, I believe to the Press.

I am sure the hon. members will be interested in all these. Then we come to hospital insurance coverage in Ontario. We have made intensive studies into (a) the present number covered, and type and degree of protection. It is surprising that in the last few years insurance coverage has grown to cover  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million people, that is, in the form of coverage, some of which are very often individual, and I would say particularly the coverages by insurance companies which are very often individual.

(b) Extent of coverage available under plans considered in Ontario's studies, and (c) the extent of coverage available under January 26, 1956, federal proposals.

4. The range of hospital benefits, (a) under existing plans. I mentioned a moment ago, the existing insurance coverages, in which there are wide variations and differences; (b) Under plans considered in Ontario's studies, (c) under January 26, 1956 federal proposals.

5. Costs of hospital care: (a) Present expenditures for hospital care: (i) Our present expenditures in active, chronic and convalescent hospitals and what the trends are as shown in the tables, what we are presently spending and what we shall have to spend on mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

(b) What it will cost under plans considered in the Ontario studies, and

(c) What it would cost if we had plans under the federal proposals.

Now we come to the all-important point, and the question of administration is really the law and the prophets:

Methods of financing: (a) what has been done under existing plans, and what would have to be done under existing plans, such as Blue Cross and private insurance companies.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister if, respecting the financing, at this conference has there been any suggestion Ottawa would have to make an assessment of premiums?

HON. MR. FROST: No, there has not been. The first and I think the most specific reference to that matter was in 1945 after the proposals. The hon. member will recollect that it was in these proposals perhaps with the covering of the comprehensive programme such as we have suggested here, the federal contribution would be 60 per cent.

That would be borne by whatever method they would choose to finance it in their taxation framework. They proposed at that time that we collect our share by way of a premium, and I also think in the form of co-insurance, which can be explained in committee.

That was a considerable time ago and perhaps I can refresh the memory of the hon. member by reminding him that some references were made to it as being a "poll tax." Perhaps he remembers that reference as to the premium contribution being a "poll tax." If not, I will not jog his memory further in that regard, but that was the proposal in 1945 and which, of course, would be the basis today for the federal contribution. Undoubtedly it would be feasible for the Federal Government to collect a premium. That is quite obvious and I think the experience of Saskatchewan, which is in many ways perhaps the most attractive plan from the standpoint of administration, was that such was the case.

MR. THOMAS (Oshawa): The hon. Prime Minister cannot help but be fair.

MR. MacDONALD: We are now coming down to facts, to see whether it is best.

HON. MR. FROST: We do not intend to raise the price of beer, as the hon. member suggested last night.

MR. MacDONALD: I have found out, since, that you raised it in 1950.

HON. MR. FROST: I think that answers the question by the hon. member for Brant. There are several methods of financing, such as the plans considered in Ontario's studies, and those contained in the January 26 proposals of the Federal Government.

There is a question to which I have referred at times when discussing this matter with others; that is, the question of financing. I think it probably is the \$64,000 question." But one which is almost as great and as difficult is the integration of the present private and public coverages. That is a difficulty which cannot be overlooked. It is a matter which is now covered I suppose by hundreds of labour contracts, by many rural co-operatives, by Blue Cross, and in various other forms, and one simply cannot step in and tear up contracts into which people have entered, and want to keep. I think we must view that with a great deal of care.

There is the eighth question which is that of the functions of The Hospital Services Commission of Ontario and its relations with hospitals. Here I get back to where I started, to the specific purposes of this Bill, and I would say to the hon. members of this House that the opinion of experts who have examined into and studied this question for us, the matter is, firstly, administration and, secondly, a wise tax system to support such expenditures as these. Upon those two factors will depend the success of such a plan as we propose to consider entering into. These are matters of immense importance to our people.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill to Establish the Hospital Services Commission of Ontario.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. Prime Minister at length this afternoon, we can say that the ghost of hospital insurance has walked in these stately halls for an hour or so, but that the hon. Prime Minister does not say "Yes" nor does not say "No."

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister has made up his mind to a point where he can permit the administration to either turn down the offer of the Federal Government, or consummate an agreement based on that offer. This afternoon he has stated that intensive studies have been made of this problem, going back over a period of two years. We are aware of the studies which have been made and the calibre of the men who conducted those studies. It would seem that a reasonable conclusion would be that, after two years of intensive study by men who were capable of making those studies intelligently, we ought to have at this time arrived at a place where we would have our minds made up as to whether we go on with it or stay put.

Before dealing at greater length with some of the statements made by the hon. Prime Minister on the particular subject of "hospital insurance," I want to turn, strangely enough, to the Bill the hon. Prime Minister has just now moved for second reading in this House. How he really connected all the argument this afternoon with what one can find in the Bill, I have a little difficulty in comprehending, but understanding the dexterity of the hon. Prime Minister, and knowing how he can connect anything with anything, I realize that is about what he has tried to do this afternoon.

The Bill presented to the House suggests the setting up of a commission, and its functions are outlined in section No. 7. This commission, amongst other things, is to have the administration of any hospital insurance which might be established by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; in other words, we are going to set up a commission to administer.

The only difficulty is there is nothing for it to administer. It is simply another commission without anything to do at the moment, and its only hope of getting anything to do in the future lies in the fact that this government may make up its mind to consummate a scheme of health insurance. But, at the moment, when we set up this commission, it will become organized, and just wait for the inevitable, because I would say to the

hon. Prime Minister that, although he asks for more time for study, the time will inevitably come—and before very long, with the events of the times through which we are passing—when the hon. Prime Minister will be forced to abandon his position of indecision, and really come to grips in a realistic way with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look for a few moments at some of the other parts of this Bill, particularly section 7. It says in (a) :

To develop and ensure the continuance throughout Ontario of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals and related health facilities.

I ask the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), does the position they seek to gain by this commission's work not obtain in the Province of Ontario at the present time? Does not this Bill suggest—as it would seem to—that there has been a lack of system in relation to hospitals, and that we must have this commission so that order may come, where chaos previously has reigned? I would not even go so far as to say there is a necessity for subsection "a" of section 7 of the Bill. I do not think the hon. Minister of Health will agree that the hospital situation in the province is such that it needs to have this mythical commission, which we are about to set up in this Bill.

And subsection "b" says :

To approve the establishment of new and additional hospital facilities.

What is the need, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, of setting up a commission, and giving that commission the power and authority to approve the establishment of new and additional hospital construction? We have a Department of Health. Surely it is cognizant of the needs which exist for hospitals throughout this province; surely it has the information—and if it does not, can obtain it—as to where these hospitals should be located. I do not know, for a moment, why we should include "b" in here, unless there has been some diffi-

culty in the mind of the hon. Minister of Health in relation to the establishment of new and additional hospital facilities.

Subsection "c" provides :

To approve the distribution of capital grants for hospital construction.

And I ask you again, Mr. Speaker, why should this House give powers to a commission to approve or disapprove the distribution of capital grants for hospital construction? Surely that lies within the ambit and jurisdiction of the Department of Health; surely it can most properly be done by that department, and not hand this particular aspect over to the commission we are just setting up.

This goes on and on, but the real meat—if meat it is; and I think it sounds almost artificial in here—is in subsection "d", which says :

To administer any system of hospital care insurance—

If there is anything in the Bill providing for the setting up of a commission, then the commission will have the power vested in it to administer hospital insurance in this province. As I said a few moments ago, we have no hospital insurance scheme; we do not know when we are going to have one—if ever. But we are setting up a commission just on the odd chance that this government may see its way clear to bring in a hospital insurance scheme.

I suggest to this House that this is a mythical commission, without any set duties, without any work to do. It is just being set up in order that the government may say, if it is called upon to explain in any manner whatever, "We have taken this one step toward the implementation of our promise to bring hospital insurance into this province." I suggest to you that is all that is in the Bill. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how I can vote against it, and I do not see how I can vote for it with any great enthusiasm.



HON. MR. PORTER: Perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition had better remain out of the House.

MR. OLIVER: These are my deductions in respect to the Bill itself. It seems to me this government will not get around to setting up a system of health insurance for some time. I can appreciate there is a great deal of study still to be made, and these studies may extend for months, and perhaps years. If I believe that—and I do—then is it reasonable to suggest that the creation of this commission could have been left until the hospital insurance scheme was more imminent than it is at the present time? If it is a step toward hospital insurance, alright. But it must be catalogued as a very feeble and faltering step by the government, which cannot make up its mind whether it wants to go ahead or stay where it is in respect to hospital insurance.

Before I leave the Bill itself, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that I was interested in reading an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* this morning. They felt called upon to say something about this Bill. It apparently felt, as one would gather from reading the editorial, that the Bill had some merit, and they do an excellent job of finding something where really there is nothing.

I would like to read from the second paragraph of this editorial, in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. In the first paragraph it speaks of the amount being spent on hospitals in the province, and how it will increase over the years. Then it says:

Against this background, and with a provincial hospital insurance scheme under serious consideration, it can readily be seen why Premier Frost has introduced a Bill in the Legislature which would give his government wide powers over the future development of Ontario's hospitals. A commission of from 3 to 7 persons will be appointed not only to operate the insurance scheme, as and when it comes, but to guide and regulate new construction by hospitals getting pro-

vincial aid. The purpose is to see that from here on, new hospitals, new beds and new facilities are located where they can be used most effectively.

It refers to the fact that one of the main functions of the commission will be to see that "new hospitals, new beds, and new facilities are located where they can be used most effectively."

I ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) if he is saying to this House this afternoon that his policy, insofar as "new hospitals, new beds and new facilities" has been, that they have not been located where they can be used most effectively? May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what can a commission do that the government is not in a position to do, in respect to these "new hospitals, new beds and new facilities"?

It seems to me it is a silly argument to use in support of this Bill, because right now, and for years past, The Department of Health has taken upon itself the proper responsibility of doing what the *Globe and Mail* says this commission could do, and do better than The Department of Health.

Then it goes on to say:

Nobody can quarrel with this decision; or deny that the lack of such regulation in the past has led to some parts of the province having more hospital beds, and some fewer, than they ought to have. There is a similar lopsidedness in the matter of facilities.

With all due deference to the *Globe and Mail*, I would say to the House this afternoon, that I see no reason for setting up this commission if that is to be its function. I have enough confidence in The Department of Health, and even in this government, to say that what the *Globe and Mail's* editorial suggests will be the commission's functions can be done equally as well by this government, and by The Department of Health.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to speak for a moment or two about this Bill going to the committee. We will send it to the Committee on Health, so that—as the hon. Prime Minister has

stated—the public will be appraised of all the ramifications included in any hospital insurance scheme. And he suggests, lest we come back to this House no wiser than we left the committee, that we have an agenda drawn up so there will be a formula which we can follow when we meet in committee.

The hon. Prime Minister suggests the letters from Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent and hon. Paul Martin be read before the committee, and that the studies which have been made shall be placed before the committee and also that the federal proposal shall be placed before that committee.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, what can the committee get from Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent's statement? It is clear and explicit, and everyone who has read it cannot interpret it in more than one way, and the same can be said of the statement of the hon. Paul Martin. What earthly use can we get from reading those statements before the committee? Everyone knows what they are. Everyone is aware of what is contained therein, and it simply will be a time-wasting effort to review this again before the committee.

So far as the federal offer is concerned, that offer, as I understand it, is explicit, and is, at the moment at least, a definite offer. What purpose can be served by examining this offer before a committee of the Legislature is beyond my comprehension.

I would tell the hon. Prime Minister there will be no change in the federal offer because of the meeting of this Committee on Health in the Province of Ontario. If there is any change or any amendment in the Federal Government's offer, it will be because of representations made to them by the Provincial Government of the Province of Ontario. It is them to whom they will listen. They have not listened to them completely as yet, nor will it as a result of any discussion which may take place in the committee of the Legislature.

It is difficult to see just what good will come out of placing this matter before the Committee on Health. You will be faced with a sheaf of documents

which will be read to the hon. members of the committee, and the hon. members of the committee will then be asked to analyze and to make suggestions. Now, the ordinary hon. member of the committee is no position, I suggest to this House, to make really constructive criticisms of a formula which has been built up over the years by competent men in the various fields which the hon. Prime Minister has mentioned this afternoon.

I say today, as I said before, that the idea of placing this before the Committee on Health of this Legislature is not to improve the situation of the province in the matter of bargaining with the Federal Government; it is simply a conveyance by which this administration can conveniently postpone the bringing into effect of hospital insurance in this province. It is a good medium through which they can do that, and I do not think for one moment that it has any other purpose, nor that it will have any other result. It seems to me that so far as the committee is concerned, it will just be a waste of time, except in certain aspects of the entire problem. However, these certain aspects, upon which the committee could have some weight, will be lost in the avalanche of weighty material which will be presented to it by the government, and their spokesmen.

I want to mention one other point. The hon. Prime Minister, I take it, is not looking for any recommendations from this committee. I believe he said so this afternoon. One of the great purposes of a committee is to analyze a subject, and then make recommendations based on its conclusions. This committee is to be denied even that privilege, so all it will be doing is listening to what somebody tells them.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if the committee in its wisdom wants to make recommendations, I will certainly be prepared to consider them, but I think it would be very unfair indeed, and almost impossible to do so in a matter of this magnitude, as will be apparent to the hon. leader of the Opposition if he attends the sittings of the committee as I hope he will—

MR. OLIVER: I think I will, yes.

HON. MR. FROST: I think it would be wise. Then he will see it is a problem of many complications and great magnitude. While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition a question arising out of a pronouncement he made last May, I believe, when there was an election in progress, and he said:

The Liberal government will integrate a provincial-wide hospital and health plan in co-operation with the Federal Government.

May I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he would mind submitting to the committee, when it meets, the studies he has made, because I am sure they would be of very great value to them.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister is more of an amateur politician than I considered him to be, because he knows quite well that pronouncement of intended policy was meant to convey to the people of Ontario that if the Federal Government made the proposition it now has made to the hon. Prime Minister, if we formed the government of this province, we would be ready to accept it, and put it into effect, and let the benefits accrue for the people of this province. The hon. Prime Minister knows this quite well, but he is a past master at twisting things around and bringing them to a point where he hopes they will redound to his benefit.

I would like to speak for a moment or two about the costs. The hon. Prime Minister says he does not want to scare anybody, but he does say in a very quiet voice that it will cost \$190 million, and that the Federal Government can be expected to contribute only some \$66 million. As the hon. Prime Minister has often said, let us be fair about these things. He said the figures he has produced were factual. Well, even factual figures can include many items which culminate in the end result the hon. Prime Minister has given this afternoon, in his figure of "\$190 million." When

the hon. Prime Minister is talking about \$190 million, he is including in that figure the cost of mental hospitals, the cost of tuberculosis hospitals, the costs of depreciation on the hospitals, mind you, and is including the costs of administering this plan.

I want to say to the House that, up to the present time, the federal offer does not go so far as to propose to share the costs for these items I have just mentioned, but the hon. Prime Minister will surely appreciate that whether we sign an agreement with the Federal Government or not, we will still have to pay for mental hospitals, tuberculosis hospitals, and for depreciation. Our situation will be unchanged. Surely, even if we do not enter into an agreement, we will have to pay, and if we do enter into an agreement as presently set out, we will still have to pay, because the items are not covered in the federal offer. When the hon. Prime Minister includes all these items in the amount of \$190 million, I would suggest to the House that he is at least colouring the picture, and making the costs seem prohibitive.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in regard to mental illness, I do not think it is at all practical to bring in a coverage here that is designed to take care of catastrophic illness, without taking care of mental illness. I do not think that mentally-ill people should have any stigma attached to them; they should be treated as sick people, and they should get the same coverage as anybody else. If they are mentally ill, they should be admitted to hospital, and be taken care of until they are cured. I think that is the only way to look at it.

MR. OLIVER: But surely we are taking care of those people as ill people today. Surely the hon. Prime Minister would not suggest that is not the case. And the same situation, from a financial point of view, will obtain in this province for years ahead, whether we have an agreement with Ottawa or not. Therefore, I say it is unfair when he includes, in the \$190 million, the cost



for these institutions for which we have paid for years, and according to the proposal of the Federal Government, will probably keep on paying for.

I do not know whether it is reasonable to suggest that the Federal Government should come in or not on these items.

HON. MR. FROST: They did in 1945.

MR. OLIVER: They have suggested that on certain items—hospital insurance and the ones the hon. Prime Minister has mentioned—they will pay to the provinces of Canada roughly 50 per cent.; in Ontario, I agree it is somewhere around 48 per cent., but in regard to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and British Columbia, they have gone it alone, without any federal contribution at all, so surely this wealthy Province of Ontario—

HON. MR. FROST: I am not going to.

MR. OLIVER: I know the hon. Prime Minister is not. And I have not said he should, but he does not have to, because the Federal Government has stated that, to the extent of \$66 million, they will contribute to hospital insurance in this province. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that is a long way from "going it alone". It is entering into a partnership with the Federal Government, and it is a very realistic approach so far as financial contributions are concerned.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as this Party is concerned, the Province of Ontario should at once proceed to negotiate an agreement with the Federal Government for hospital insurance in this province, and there need not be any more "dilly-dallying" in respect to this problem. The hon. Prime Minister has all the information he needs; he has had very able men gathering information, he does not need to go on for another 10 years trying to find out statistically whether we should go into this matter or not. If he has not found

out by now, he never will. He should be in the position—and I think he is—of saying to this House this afternoon whether he is prepared to accept the federal offer or whether he is going to keep stalling as he almost intimates he is going to do by the remarks he has made to this House.

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that I cannot agree with him regarding this committee. This committee will be a very, very realistic one, and I think we all must remember that we are living in a generation which is different from any generation which has ever preceded us. We have problems today with which no other generation has had to cope.

I would like to mention briefly some of those problems; first, we have a very rapidly increasing population. Ontario has increased, since 1946, at the rate of about 140,000 to 150,000 people a year. Then, we have an ageing population. Although we are all happy to see the expectancy of life increased, nevertheless, it does create a great number of problems.

Then, our way of life today is entirely different to what it was 10 or 15 years ago. Instead of the father being the only one in the house who is the breadwinner, in many cases, both parents are working. This generation is better educated. We might say they are a "demanding generation", and I have no quarrel with that at all, in fact, I think it is rightly so. They are demanding the best possible hospital facilities for themselves and their loved ones.

Then we come to what the medical profession as well as hospital associations have been demanding for the last few years. This demand has not been made by these two bodies in the Province of Ontario alone, it has been made throughout Canada and the United States of America.

What they are asking for is what will, in the main, probably be the most important functions of this commission, that is for proper segregation in our

hospitals. They want the proper number of active, convalescent and chronic beds. They want to divide up Ontario and the other provinces into regions so they can have a medical centre where they will have all facilities, and around that centre, certain smaller hospitals with the facilities needed for minor medical, obstetrical and surgical services.

The last thing I would like to mention is the accreditation of hospitals. That was started in the United States by the American College of Surgeons, but it has been carried out here in Ontario on a voluntary basis only. When I say that, I mean the hospital has to make application to have accreditation and it is on a purely voluntary basis. Now, "accreditation" means that we have a proper nursing staff, a proper uniform accounting system, proper medical services, and also medical men within our hospitals, and I am including surgeons and all specialists when I say this. I include those who have had enough training to do the work which they have to do within that hospital. This is very, very important.

These are the reasons why we need a commission so badly, some authority to carry out all these things to meet the problems of today, because we are meeting new problems every day. As a matter of fact, it is terrific, the magnitude of the new problems with which we have to cope.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister expressed his thanks to those responsible for making this study of a comprehensive hospital programme for this province. I feel I would be remiss if I did not endorse his remarks.

In fact, as Minister of Health of this province, I would like very much to add my personal appreciation and thanks to the committee, which has carried out a task of tremendous magnitude. The committee consists of Mr. George Tattle, the finance comptroller of the Department of Health, who is chairman; Prof. Malcolm Taylor, Ph.D., professor of economics at the University of Toronto; Mr. Stanley Martin, who is executive secretary of the Ontario Hospital Asso-

ciation, and Mr. David Ogilvie, who is director of the Blue Cross.

Then, with these gentlemen, we have the hon. Vice-Chairman of Hydro, who is a member of the Treasury Board; we have the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Porter), and I would like to thank him and also his Deputy, Mr. Hugh Brown, and Mr. George Gathercole, in fact, all who had to do with gathering this information.

Last, but by no means least, I want to thank the officials of my department, who have gone to no end of trouble in trying to secure the necessary statistics and information asked for by the committee. This was spearheaded by the Deputy Minister of Health for Ontario, Doctor John Phair.

The broad outline of the purposes of a Hospital Services Commission for Ontario was given by the hon. Prime Minister when he introduced to this House an Act to establish the Hospital Services Commission on Monday, March 5. The provisions of that Act are before you.

As I have previously indicated, our first interest is the health of the people of this province, and we must be assured that the required services are provided in our hospital programme. The hospitals in Ontario are in the vanguard of progress among such institutions in North America. Many of our hospitals are outstanding; most of them are excellent. It is only reasonable to assume that some of them may need help.

In the past 8 or 9 years, remarkable progress has been made in the development of hospital facilities. In 1947, we had about 16,400 active, convalescent and chronic hospital beds. With the assistance of the provincial grant programme introduced in December, 1946, and the federal scheme introduced in 1948, as well as the really commendable municipal and voluntary assistance, the number has been increased to more than 28,000 beds today.

I want to give a great deal of credit to our municipalities and also to the great body of public-spirited citizens who have gone forward with the great

work of construction of new beds in their own communities. With nearly 5,000 further beds approved, which are either under construction or in the planning stage, by 1958 we hope to have 33,000 beds.

I would like to point out that, in spite of quite substantial grants for chronic care facilities, most of the increase in beds has been in active treatment hospitals. In one sense, this is natural and normal because it is acute illness we must take care of first.

In this connection, however, one fact must be kept in mind, which is that, under existing insurance schemes, it is chiefly treatment in general hospitals that is provided. For example, Blue Cross will take care of its subscribers to a maximum of 51 days of chronic care, and this only once in the lifetime of the contract. It is the opinion of many people that this factor in insurance coverage has tended to accentuate the already existing preoccupation of a community with the general hospital, and thereby bringing about the neglect of other necessary types of facilities.

While a large proportion of all hospital beds must continue to be in active treatment units for accidents and acute illnesses, it is becoming more and more apparent that, with an ageing population subject to degenerative disease, more facilities must be available for the long-stay patient. This was the underlying purpose which prompted this government to propose in its studies that chronic and convalescent care should be included as a benefit in any programme considered by the government.

If we were to exclude such benefits, we would find the long-term patient an ever increasing problem in our expensive general hospital beds. This would, in turn, result in long waiting lists and increased pressures from the community, resulting in over building of costly general hospital facilities. It should be pointed out, however, that care and caution must be exercised in order that these chronic facilities do not become utilized by patients requiring domiciliary care only.

Furthermore, speaking as a doctor with years of experience, I may say that the highly organized general hospital is not the best place for such a patient. The convalescent, or the long-term chronic patient, requires services and facilities set up to meet his special needs. However, the convalescent or chronically ill person may become acutely ill and need the special care which can be provided only in a general hospital with highly organized services and most up-to-date technical equipment. In my opinion, therefore, the special facilities required by convalescent and chronic patients must be located close to the general hospitals in order that any care that may be required will be available on short notice.

It would appear, therefore, that one of the first tasks of the Hospital Services Commission would be to encourage the building of an increased number of beds for convalescent and chronic patients. The medical reason for so doing is apparent, and the economic reason is equally compelling. Such beds can be built for less cost than active treatment beds. They can be operated at, roughly, half the cost of active treatment beds. It is in our best interests to do what is both economically and medically sound.

It is obvious that the distinction between acutely ill, convalescent, and chronically ill patients is not clear cut. We must not be too definite at this time about how our hospital beds should be distributed among these categories. We must never lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with sick people in several stages of illness, and the facilities must be available in the right proportion to look after them in the most effective, the most efficient, and the most economical manner possible.

I should think that the Hospital Services Commission, working closely with the medical profession, could begin with a survey of patients in active treatment hospitals to determine their real needs. Such a survey would give us the required facts on which to base our future needs, providing, as well, a guide for future construction.

One of the questions most frequently



directed to me is: "Have we enough beds to take care of the increased demands under an insurance programme?" This is not an easy question to answer, but we do have in Ontario a substantial amount of useful material on which to base reasonable estimates. We have accurate data on the demand for hospital care from people already insured. We know, also, the amount of hospital care that has been provided for our entire population. From these it is possible for us to calculate the amount of care now being received by the people who are not insured.

If we assume that the people who are now insured will continue to increase the use of hospital services at about the same rate that they are now doing, and assume, also, that the people who are not insured will increase their use of hospital services to the same rate the presently insured people do, by 1958 we will be required to provide 8½ million days of care in active treatment hospitals.

With the number of hospital beds that we now have, and the number that will come into operation by 1958, we should be able to supply that amount of hospital care if the general hospitals were to operate at an average occupancy of 85 per cent. In the first year or two of the plan, and until we obtain an adequate supply of convalescent and chronic beds, this is a not unreasonable rate of occupancy.

In the years to come, the bed situation will greatly improve as we obtain the additional chronic and convalescent care facilities that we require. Whether or not we will obtain the lower cost facilities that we need will depend in large measure on the community understanding of this need. When local community leaders become fully aware of the magnitude of the changing problem, the need for this type of institution will be understood.

I should like to point out that the hon. members of this House have a duty to guide local thinking and to point out the need to provide facilities for all types of care. A balanced system of hospital facilities can be achieved only

through leadership by people in touch with the situation and informed about the problem.

In our studies, we have considered also the importance of out-patients' services in any insurance scheme. If such services are available through out-patient departments of hospitals, there will be less necessity for people to enter hospital and occupy beds solely for diagnostic purposes. Expanded out-patient facilities should help to reduce the demand for in-patient service.

Everywhere on this continent and in Great Britain there has been increasing public interest in hospitals and in the operation of hospitals. This has been matched, or even exceeded, by the interest of hospital authorities themselves. One of the most noticeable advances in the improvement of hospital standards has been the participation of the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Hospital Association in the accreditation programme. These two associations are financing their share of the costs.

Under the programme, the hospitals are accredited according to certain standards set up by the Joint Commission on accreditation of hospitals. It is to this kind of self-government that the Hospital Services Commission could give great assistance through consultant and other services it may provide.

The cost of providing hospital care continues to increase and, while there had been some hope that they would have levelled off by this time, it is now apparent that these costs will continue to rise for some time. This is explainable on several grounds.

First, advances in medical science have made necessary further developments of specialized treatment facilities in our hospitals. These require more materials, more expensive equipment, and more highly skilled staff.

Secondly, salary and wage scales of hospital personnel, which have traditionally lagged behind rates for other employed groups in the communities, are steadily being increased but have not as yet reached a point of stabilization.

Thirdly, despite more efficient use of

personnel, hospitals are faced with the difficult task of meeting 24-hour services in the face of the universal trend to a 5-day, 40-hour week.

All of these factors, when given careful consideration, seem to indicate that continuing increases in hospital costs must be anticipated if the problem is to be faced in a realistic manner. As a matter of fact, these increases are inevitable, whether we have a hospital insurance programme or not.

Like almost all other professional institutions, the hospitals at present are faced with the shortage of qualified personnel. There is one natural explanation for this, and that is that, in the nursing service and in many of the technical fields, it is the young women who assume a large amount of responsibility. Unfortunately for the hospitals, though perhaps fortunately for the young women, they are more attracted to the institution of matrimony than to a hospital institution.

We can expect, in the first year or two of the operation of any insurance programme, that there will be a greater demand for service with, perhaps, no marked improvement in the availability of trained personnel. With careful planning, however, and preparation in advance, the commission should be able to do much to overcome this situation. It will obviously seek the guidance of the hospitals and the medical profession and, fortunately, we have available the basic material from which to work in the Health Survey Report published in 1951, and prepared by the Ontario Health Survey Committee.

I should like to wind up my remarks today on a note of caution. If we proceed in Ontario we are embarking upon an enormous undertaking. A comprehensive hospital service programme, including the care of the mentally ill and the tuberculous would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$190 million in 1956. The lion's share of this must come from the people of Ontario. It is our duty to them to build carefully and well. The base established now must be sound so that we can build on it in the future. There is no point in pretending that any-

thing is free—someone must pay for it. We have an obligation to the people of this province to see that services of the highest quality are made available at costs within the reach of all and within the economic capacity of our province.

MR. D. MacDONALD: (York South): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by assuring the government with its shaky majority which I know will be quaking in its shoes, that we shall support this Bill without any qualifications at all.

HON. MR. FROST: Perhaps that will help the hon. leader of the Opposition to make up his mind.

MR. MacDONALD: I was coming to his remarks and was going to say at least he is consistent. His doubts about commissions which he expressed the other day when dealing with the water commission have been expressed today in the same full-blown nature, and whether or not he is going to be able to make up his mind to vote for it is a question.

If I might just briefly mention—and I hope I can avoid a political storm on this subject—it strikes me as passing strange to hear a representative of a Party arise in his place and criticize the government for this feeble and fumbling step forward towards health insurance, when that hon. member happens to be the leader of a Party whose federal colleagues have not done anything, even in a "feeble and fumbling manner," until a month or so ago, and which has been in full retreat since 1945.

MR. OLIVER: If the hon. member wants to be fair, he will grant that the Federal Liberal Government has brought in more social legislation in this country than any other government.

HON. MR. WARRENDER: That is not true.

MR. OLIVER: And whatever steps forward have been taken in health insurance have been taken by the present Federal Government.



MR. MacDONALD: Nothing was done until the CCF party was increasing in strength and the Federal Government was forced to do it.

MR. NIXON: The CCF party have only one federal member in Ontario.

MR. MacDONALD: There will be a change in that, but during the war when the CCF Party became the official opposition in two or three provinces, and formed the government in one province, was the time when great changes came about, and there have been few, if any, since then, simply because the threat from the CCF has momentarily been lessened.

The hon. leader of the Opposition talks about the government sitting on its "position of indecision," which was rather a delightful way of putting it, but we must again come to the conclusion that the Liberal Party has been sitting on a comparable position of indecision since 1919, and I repeat it is rather strange indeed to hear the Liberal criticism. They first announced, for their programme, health insurance in 1919, and even then they had stolen it from the socialist and labour parties after the turn of the century.

I want to try to deal with 4 different points, and I hope I can conclude before the adjournment hour.

Firstly—and this is where I can quite sincerely give my support to this commission and where apparently with equal sincerity the hon. leader of the Opposition cannot—even if we do not move forward on the proposition of a hospital plan, and I trust that we shall, but even if we do not, the first function which will be performed by this commission is very important. That is, to develop and insure the continuance throughout Ontario of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals and related health facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I must say quite frankly, I do not know to what extent The Department of Health has attempted to co-ordinate the development of hospitals, nor the amount of friction which has existed in the

development and the support of our hospitals between the cities and the surrounding communities over the past few years.

I was in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) not long ago and discovered in that area there were some pretty sharp views with regard to sharing the costs of the hospitals in Owen Sound as between the city and the surrounding communities.

That is a problem which existed, and which was bobbing into this periodically when I was living in Ottawa. It is a problem all across this province. To get back to the workable experiment—the only hospital insurance plan that we have in Canada up until now which is workable is the plan in Saskatchewan. I would draw the attention of the House to this fact that when they started to build the plan back in 1944, immediately after they were elected, they then had only 3½ beds per 1,000 population. They started to build their required hospitals on the basis of a well thought-out and systematic plan encompassing the whole province, so that they were able to develop 3 kinds of hospitals: the small local hospital with its relatively limited facilities, but yet sufficient to care for maternity and other limited cases in the community; secondly, regional hospitals for such cases which require greater facilities, and finally, the comparatively few major hospitals in the cities where they would have all the facilities which might be available in any hospital anywhere across this country.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, they knit them all together with something to which we might give consideration here, that is, a hospital air ambulance, which made it possible for emergency cases to be brought from any locality to the regional or city hospital, when patients required the kind of treatment those hospitals could give.

In Ontario, because of the rather unco-ordinated—and I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is correct in so describing it—the unco-ordinated relatively chaotic development we have in our hospital setup in terms of meeting



the full needs and the future expansion in this province, I think there is a role for a commission to fulfill, and even if there was nothing else for them to do, that role might well occupy some of its time at least.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member think that if a Minister cannot do it, a commission can?

MR. MacDONALD: Conceivably so.

MR. OLIVER: Quite a conception.

MR. NIXON: At least we have the hon. Minister in the House.

MR. OLIVER: What is the hon. member going to do with the hon. Minister?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. He is from the hon. leader of the Opposition's part of the country.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members should not disagree now.

MR. MacDONALD: Point number two, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to raise—and I do it with some puzzlement—is the hon. Prime Minister's reiteration that there is no commitment to bring in a plan. Quite frankly, listening to him today, I noted he spent most of the time he was speaking about this Bill in discussing the "plan" that is emerging. He said very little about what was in the Bill, but was talking about the plan that was emerging. I do not know why he has to be so coy and say that he has no commitment, for if so, why bother talking about it?

I should like to remind the hon. Prime Minister that it was precisely that kind of airy skating around the issue which created what was for me a satisfying, but for him a distinctly unsatisfying, experience at a labour convention last fall. The hon. Prime Minister explained to that convention what the government's plans were with regard to health insurance and he prefaced the discussion on it by this statement, and I quote

again from that authoritative journal, the *Globe and Mail*:

He said:

"The time has come for genuine action and not merely to talk of an idea that is away in the future."

HON. MR. FROST: I agree with that.

MR. MacDONALD: I hope the hon. Prime Minister does, and if he does agree with it, why does he have to go around coyly saying: "I have still made no commitment," and talk for an hour and 15 minutes to the House about the plan that is emerging?

HON. MR. FROST: They are both consistent.

MR. MacDONALD: If they are, Mr. Speaker, then this is free advice to the hon. Prime Minister, that when he adopted that role before the labour meeting that afternoon, they slapped a resolution at him saying: "We want it now", and next morning they turned down a resolution thanking the government for its initiative. Then, the next day, to my profound satisfaction, they almost voted to align themselves with the CCF, although they are traditionally neutral politically.

The third point I wish to mention, Mr. Speaker, is really in support of the gain which has been made by the government that in many of the aspects of this proposal which is now being discussed with the Federal Government, that it is felt that the province has a just claim and that the Federal Government should come in and share the costs.

I agree with the hon. Prime Minister in that respect. If the Federal Government was doing what they promised in 1945, it is a promise from which the Liberals were in full retreat, until this government "jockeyed" them into action, and now they are, in turn, "jockeying" this government into action, a most interesting situation between the federal Liberals and the government Tories. But if Ottawa had fulfilled their promise made in 1945, such items as

they are apparently not now willing to meet, would be included in the proposal.

To list them, I think that clearly as important an element of hospitalization as the long-term needs of tuberculosis and of mental hospitals should be covered, out-patients should be covered, a home care programme instituted, for the simple reason that it would relieve our overcrowded hospitals by the handling of such cases outside the hospitals whenever possible. And finally, of course, administrative costs are just as much a part of the plan as anything else, and I see no reason why they should not be included.

The hon. Prime Minister says he is an optimist, that he is going to go to Ottawa to continue the negotiations, and in this, as with another item which we discussed yesterday, I hope he can bargain "toughly" and come back with the best possible deal.

My final point, Mr. Speaker, is that in trying to come to grips with this over-all figure, one might be either encouraged or frightened, and I must say that I have been profoundly encouraged by the figures quoted this afternoon. Let us take a look at them. The over-all cost is \$190 million, of which the Federal Government is going to pay some \$66 million, leaving the Provincial Government with the responsibility for \$123 million in the first year of the plan. That includes a comprehensive plan, so it represents what we are now spending on mental hospitals, \$26 million, for tuberculosis hospitals \$7 million, and about \$8 million for Workmen's Compensation and related services now being provided.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member that Workmen's Compensation does not come into the picture. Workmen's Compensation and the Department of Veterans' Affairs Hospitals are entirely separate from this plan.

MR. MacDONALD: Well, the hon. Prime Minister included it last year in his calculations and what I am trying to do is list those we are now covering which come to approximately \$40

million. Taking that \$40 million from \$123 million leaves a figure of \$83 million to be contributed by the people of the Province of Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacDONALD: Now how are we to meet it? The hon. Prime Minister suggested two ways, by premiums and by contribution from the general revenue. I want to pause here, Mr. Speaker, and say that I hope the hon. Prime Minister has given the full picture here and that in effect what he has stated is that the whole picture of deterrent costs and co-insurance have been shoved "out the window", where it should be. He said nothing on that.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss that in committee. I must admit that I am one of those who remains in doubt and unconvinced on that point. I should like to have the committee discuss that. There are some very real reasons that could be advanced for some co-insurance. However, I do not want to prejudice the matter.

MR. MacDONALD: I think there are some very real reasons that can be advanced against these extra charges.

HON. MR. FROST: That may well be.

MR. MacDONALD: For the simple reason that what it does is to levy an additional cost, as well as the premium, on a person admitted to hospital, and already facing the costs incurred by illness, and I think such extra costs should be met from general revenue rather than to put them upon a person already burdened with sickness.

HON. MR. FROST: The argument advanced is its deterrent effects on hospital costs, to avoid the needless use of hospitals, but again I say I have remained unconvinced on the point and I would like to hear it discussed in the committee. The hon. member for York South can then ask such questions as he sees fit.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the merits and demerits of the plan, which we have touched on only casually, there is another very good reason why they should not be included in any plan as part of this delightful "jockeying" which has gone on between the Federal Government and the Government of Ontario. The Federal Government has laid down the principle—that deterrent and co-insurance costs will not be part of the shareable expense the Federal Government will meet. Therefore, if this government opposes it, it means that the people of Ontario will be paying the total cost, rather than meeting only their share, which I think is an added reason beside the merits and demerits it should be considered.

HON. MR. FROST: Might I point out that I believe the two western provinces, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, both have that co-insurance feature.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has no co-insurance feature.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Oshawa): No, it has not.

MR. MacDONALD: Alberta may have, but Alberta has a very bizarre kind of plan. And in British Columbia I suspect, although he may not admit it, the hon. Prime Minister deep down is aware that what happened was a financial bungling on the part of the Conservatives and Liberals in that province, and that they then dropped their "bungling," and put it on a sales-tax basis, a very precarious system, not at all the workable plan they have in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is quite the same, as the price of beer. Let the hon. member for York South not forget that.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted when I was trying to make my point as to why I think these figures are not the kind of things that should be scaring us. The amount

that will have to be met by the people of the province in premiums or out of our treasury, apart from what we are now spending, is approximately \$82 million to \$85 million. If you figure that on a personal basis with  $5\frac{1}{4}$  million people, that is about \$15 per person or, for an average family of  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , approximately \$50 a family, if we were to meet all of it by premiums. Now clearly if we contribute out of general revenue, those premiums can be brought down to a level which I think would be within the means of the average family budget, in other words, to somewhere in the neighbourhood of the premium they have in Saskatchewan, where it is \$15 per person, \$30 for man and wife, \$5 for the first and second child, and a maximum of \$40 per family.

Which brings me to my final point, and here I am willing to stand four-square with the hon. leader of the Opposition. He has doubts as to what is going to happen in the committee. He says we have had all these studies made and are going to rehash stuff which has been studied, and on which experts have come to conclusions and, while it may be valuable for us to acquaint ourselves with that information, I do not think it is necessary for action. I quote the hon. Prime Minister himself when he spoke to the labour convention last fall:

The time has come for genuine action and not merely the talk of an idea that is away off in the future.

HON. MR. FROST: What did I say then? What was that?

MR. MacDONALD: That was when the hon. Prime Minister spoke to the labour meeting which I mentioned previously.

HON. MR. FROST: But what did I say again?

MR. OLIVER: Be modest, do not ask to hear it twice.

MR. MacDONALD: I have quoted it twice.



HON. MR. FROST: Oh, is that the same one?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Let us hear it again.

HON. MR. FROST: That was a good statement.

MR. MacDONALD: It had a rather good effect on the convention too. If the presentation, Mr. Speaker, of all this material to the committee is in the nature of a "stall," so we are going to have further months and years of consideration, I say to the hon. Prime Minister that what he is preparing to do is a case of gross deception on the people of this province, because they have been led to believe, whether he says there is a commitment now or not, that there is a commitment, and let us not use this committee as a further "stall." Let us use this committee, which is really not necessary, for making the final preparations for getting a genuine plan which is workable and about which the government has talked for 13 years, and the Liberals for something like 37 years.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, just a brief word in connection with my support of the hon. Prime Minister on this Bill.

At times I agree with what the hon. leader of the Opposition has to say, and we get along fine, but I am rather surprised at what he has said this afternoon in connection with this Bill, and the Committee on Health. It is my pleasure to be a member of that committee, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you and the hon. leader of the Opposition that I intend to ask some questions and I am sure there will be many others who will ask questions which will be of interest, not only to members of the committee, but to the public at large.

Although we have had statements from Ottawa and we have had statements here, hon. members of the House will individually have an opportunity in committee to come to grips with the situation and ask questions. Some of

them have been asked in the House today, but there are others we would like to ask from the experts in this committee. I have two or three that I can think of, Mr. Speaker, for example, what is it going to cost the individual family? Is it going to be \$1 a week, \$4 a month or \$8, or 62 cents?

I think the cost is rather important, and a great number of people of our province who think they are possibly going to get free insurance will be interested in knowing what specified amount it is going to cost them each week, or each month, to participate in this government hospital plan. To my mind that is important. Money is important, and I do not think the public is particularly interested in the contributory aspect of the premium, or whether it is necessary to take some money out of the general fund of the province, as long as they do not have to pay too high a premium for the protection they are going to get.

And while we are on the subject of premium, Mr. Speaker I think one of the big problems—and certainly one of the difficulties in this whole proposal—is the collection of premiums. Now there are many aspects to be considered and studied here, and I for one will be intensely interested in what our advisors in the committee have to say in connection with this particular problem.

Certainly in other provinces they have financed a hospital plan by means of a sales tax. I speak for myself and I think also for a great number of hon. members, Mr. Speaker, when I say that we do not anticipate any increase in sales tax in this province, and I suggest further that the general public would be just a little hesitant about accepting a hospital plan if it meant some form of additional sales tax.

There are such things as the home care aspect of the plan which the hon. Prime Minister covered very adequately today. I feel that when this plan is put into effect, probably the hospital situation at that time may not be adequate to cover everybody who feels they should have hospital care. What provision are we going to make for home

care? That is a very important item, because there are many accidents and diseases which occur to citizens of the province which do not necessitate hospital care, but which do require some type of care, and I think our people would expect to pay for them.

The Federal Government has made some very fine suggestions and proposals here, and when we are talking in terms of \$66 million, that is a great deal of money and I just wonder whether we can afford to turn it down.

As far as the CCF hon. member saying that we are "stalling" on the plan, Mr. Speaker; we must remember that our government has definitely made a study of this plan which the Federal Government has simply discussed for 35 years. We have made a study of it, we have brought forward a Bill to provide such a plan at the proper time. We are sending the study documents to a committee of elected representatives of the House to which all members of the public, as I understand it, will have access. Anybody can attend this committee: its sittings are open to the public to listen to, observe and make any suggestions that they might like to make. In other words, we are doing something about it.

However, I do not feel that we want to get ourselves into the position of British Columbia, for example, where they just hit on a scheme and put it into effect without too much study, and the first thing they knew it was submerged, as it was not economically possible.

We are not going to do things that way here, and with the co-operation of the citizens and the hon. members, and a real down-to-earth and realistic approach to this by the Committee on Health, I am firmly convinced that we can do a good job.

It is my personal opinion that this

Hospital Commission, in the long run, will have more to do with the hospital administration of an Ontario hospital plan for its citizens, than it will have to do with the hospitals, and as the years go by and this plan takes effect, I am convinced that it will be in effect probably much sooner than the hon. leader of the Opposition seems to think, and that it will move slowly and cautiously at all times, in the best interests of the citizens of our province.

Mr. Whicher moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we shall meet at 2 o'clock, as was agreed upon today, and proceed with the Budget debate. In connection with the Bill which we have just been debating, I do not intend to press it forward, and cause inconvenience to the hon. members of the House. Tomorrow and the next day we will proceed with Budget debate, and possibly will proceed again with this matter on Monday. If there are hon. members who want to speak on the subject, I do not intend to put any time limit on the debate, just so that we can get to the committee on Tuesday. If the debate on this Bill is not completed on second reading, by Tuesday, we will proceed just the same with the consideration of it, and other matters in committee, so that the fullest opportunity for debate may be afforded.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that all of us would be very much interested in hearing what hon. members have to say in connection with the problems which are clearly before us in the matter of this study which has been given to the House today.

Hon. Mr. Frost moves the adjournment of the House. Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5 o'clock p.m.













Gov.Doc. Ontario. Legislative  
Ont Assembly  
L Debates and Proceedings  
1955/56,v.1

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

---

---

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY**



